

A BRIEF
DISCOURSE
OF THE
Real Presence
OF THE
Body and Blood of **CHRIST**
In the Celebration of the
HOLY EUCHARIST:
WHEREIN

The Witty Artifices of the Bishop of *Meaux* and of Mon-
sieur *Maimbourg* are obviated, whereby they would
draw in the Protestants to imbrace the Doctrine of

Transubstantiation.



John 6. v. 54, 63.

Ὁ τρώγων μου ῥ. σῆμα, καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Ἡ σὰρξ ἐκ ὁφελοῦ ἔσθῃ. τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντες, πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ
ζωῇ αὐτοῦ.

Calvin. Instit. lib. 4. cap. 17.

*In sacra sua Cæna jubet me Christus sub Symbolis panis ac vini corpus ac sanguinem
suum sumere, manducare ac bibere. Nihil dubito quin & ipse verè porrigat
& ego recipiam. Tantùm absurda rejicio qua aut celesti illius Majestate in-
digna, aut ab humana ejus naturæ veritate aliena esse, apparent.*

by Dr H. More.

The Second Edition.

L O N D O N,
Printed for *Walter Kettilby* at the *Bishop's Head* in *St Paul's*
Church-Yard, MDC LXXXVI.

A BRIEF
DISCOURSE

OF THE
HOLY TRINITY

IN THE EPISTLES OF THE
HOLY APOSTLES

TRANSLATED

John A. V. ...
...
...

...
...
...

20186
20186

LONDON,
Printed for John Knolly at the Bible Office, Fleet Street, S. Paul's
Church-Yard, MDCCLXXVI.

A BRIEF DISCOURSE OF THE Real Presence.

CHAP. I.

1. *The occasion of writing this Treatise.* 2. *The sense of the Church of England touching Transubstantiation.* 3. *Three Passages in her Articles, Liturgie and Homilies that seem to imply a Real Presence.* 4. *A yielding, at least for the present, that the Church of England is for a Real Presence, but of that Flesh and Blood of Christ which he discourses of in the sixth Chapter of St. John's Gospel, though she be for a Real Absence of that which hung on the Cross.* 5. *That our Saviour himself distinguishes betwixt that Flesh and Bloud he bore about with him, and that he there so earnestly discourses of.* 6. *That this Divine Food there discoursed of, the Flesh and Blood of Christ, is most copiously to be fed upon in the Holy Eucharist, and that our Communion-Service alludes to the same, nor does by such a Real Presence imply any Transubstantiation.*

B.

1. THE

1. **T**HE occasion of writing this short Treatise was this. I observing the Papers herein *England*, published in behalf of the Church of *Rome*, and for the drawing off People from the Orthodox Faith of the Church of *England*, which holds with the ancient pure Apostolick Church in the *Primitive* Times, before that general *Degeneracy* of the Church came in, to drive at nothing more earnestly, than the maintaining their grand Error touching the Eucharist, viz. their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; Into which they would bring back the *Reformed* Churches, by taking hold of some Intimations, or more open Professions of theirs, of a *Real Presence* (though they absolutely deny the *Roman* Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*) and thus intangling and insnaring them in those free professions touching that Mystery of the *Eucharist*, would by hard pulling hale them into that rightfully-relinquish'd Errour, for which and several others, they justly left the Communion of the Church of *Rome*: I thought it my Duty, so far as my Age, and Infirmitie of my Body will permit, to endeavour to extricate the *Reformation*, and especially our Church of *England*, from these Entanglements with which these witty and cunning Writers would entangle Her, in Her Concessions touching that mysterious Theory; and to shew there is no clashing betwixt her declaring against *Transubstantiation*, and those Passages which seem to imply a *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ at the Celebration of the Holy *Eucharist*.

2. Concerning which, that we may the more clearly judge, we will bring into view what She says touching them both. And as touching the former.

(Article

(Article 28.) her words are these : " Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine in the Supper of the Lord) cannot be proved by Holy Writ ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture , overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many Superstitions.] And in the latter part of the *Rubrick* at the end of the *Communion-Service*, She says, " That the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural Substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians) and the *natural* Body and Bloud of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here, it being against the *Truth* of Christ's *natural* Body to be at one time in more places than one.] This is sufficiently express against *Transubstantiation*.

3. Now those passages that seem to imply a *Real Presence* in the *Eucharist* are these. In the above-named Article 28. *The Body of Christ*, saith our Church, *is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an Heavenly and Spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.* Against which our Adversaries suggest, That no Faith can make us actually receive and eat that, which is, God knows, how far distant from us ; and that therefore we imply that the Body of Christ is really present in the *Eucharist*. Another Passage occurs in our *Catechism*, where it is told us, *That the inward part of the Sacrament, or thing signified, is the Body and Bloud of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.* Where [verily] and [indeed] seems to imply a *Real Presence* and Participation of the Body and Bloud of Christ. The last place shall be that in the *Homily*, of *worthy receiving* and reverend esteeming of the Sacra-

ment of the Body and Blood of Christ. The words are these, "But thus much we must be sure to hold, "that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain Ceremony, no *bare Sign*, no *untrue Figure* of a *thing absent*. "But as the Scripture saith, The Table of the Lord, "the Bread and Cup of the Lord, the Memory of "Christ, the Annunciation of his Death, yea the *Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marvellous Incorporation, which by the Operation of the Holy Ghost* (the very bond of our conjunction with "Christ) is through Faith wrought in the Souls of the "faithful: Whereby not only their Souls live to Eternal Life, but they surely trust to win their Bodies a "Resurrection to Immortality.] And immediately there is added, "The true understanding of this Fruition and Union which is betwixt the Body and the "Head, betwixt the true Believers and Christ, the ancient Catholick Fathers both perceiving themselves, "and commending to their people, were not afraid to "call this Supper, some of them, the Salve of Immortality, and Sovereign Preservative against Death; "others the *Deisick Communion*, others the sweet "Dainties of our Saviour, the Pledg of Eternal Health, "the Defence of Faith, the Hope of the Resurrection; "Others the Food of Immortality, the Healthful "Grace, and the Conservatory to everlasting Life.] There are so many high Expressions in these passages, that our Adversaries who would by this Hook pluck us back again into the Error of *Transubstantiation*, will unavoidably imagine and alledg from hence, that if we will stand to the Assertions of our own Church, we must acknowledge the *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of our Saviour in the Sacrament.

4. And let us be so civil to them as, at least for the present, to yield, that understanding it in a due sense,

sense, we do acknowledge the *Real Presence*. But it does not at all follow from thence, that we must hold that that very Body of Christ that hung upon the Cross, and whose Blood was there shed, is *really* present in the Sacrament; but that our Church, speaking conformably to Christ's Discourse on this Matter in the sixth of *John*, and to the ancient primitive Fathers, whose expressions do plainly allude to that Discourse of our Saviour's in the sixth of *S. John*, doth assert both a *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ to be received by the faithful in the *Eucharist*, and also a *Real Absence* of that Body and Blood that was crucified and shed on the Cross. And this seems to be the express Doctrine of our Saviour in the above-mentioned Chapter of *S. John*, where the *Eternal Word* incarnate speaks thus---

John 6. v. 51. *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven*, (viz. the Manna which the Psalmist calls the Food of Angels, also) *if any eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever* (viz. of this true Manna, of which the Manna in the Wilderness was but a Type) *and the Bread that I will give is my flesh* (which therefore still is that immortalizing Manna, the true Bread from Heaven) *which I will give for the life of the World*, that the whole Intellectual Creation may live thereby, it being their vivifick Food. For as you may gather by *vers. 62, 63.* he does not understand his flesh that hung on the Cross. And it was the ignorance of the Jews that they thought he did: and therefore they cried out on him, saying, *v. 52. How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* And that is because they took him to be a mere man, or an ordinary man, not the incarnate Logos. Which Logos *Clemens Alexandrinus* calls ἀνθρωπὸν ἀπαράκλητον, *the impassible man*; and *Trisemigistus*, τὸ τῷ θεῷ παρόντα ἀνθρωπὸν ἵνα διελθῇμεν δι' αὐτοῦ, *that*

one:

one man the Son of God born of him, which he says is *ὁ γεννητός* & *παλιγενετός*, the Author of Regeneration, as having the Life in him, the *Zōn*, John 1. v. 4. and this *Zōn* or Life the Divine or Spiritual Body, one necessary Element of Regeneration, which mystery we cannot here insist upon. But in the mean time let us observe our Saviour's Answer to this Scruple of the Jews; He is so far from receding from what he said, that he with all earnestness and vehemency asserts the same again.

Then Jesus said unto them, *Verily, verily I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of man (that is of the Messiah, or the Word Incarnate) and drink his blood, you have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath Eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me (viz. that eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood) even he shall live by me. This is that bread that came down from Heaven, not as your Fathers did eat Manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this Bread, shall live for ever.*

5. This is that *earnest, lofty and sublime* discourse of our Saviour touching his *real* Flesh and Blood, that the scandal given to the Jews could not drive him off from; and persisting in it, he gave also offence to his Disciples, that muttered and said, *This is an hard saying, Who can hear it?* Wherefore I must confess ingenuously, that it seems to me incredible, that under so *lofty mysterious* a Style, and *earnest* asseveration of what he affirms, though to the scandal of both the Jews and his own Disciples, there should not be couched some most weighty and profound Truth concerning

concerning some *real* Flesh and Blood of his, touching which this vehement and sublime Discourse is framed, which is a piece of that part of the Christian Philosophy (as some of the Antients call Christianity) which *Origen* terms *σοφια*. The *Object* of this eating and drinking is the *Flesh* and *Blood* of *Christ*: But to rectifie the errour of his Disciples, he plainly affirms, that he doth not mean what he said, of the *Flesh* and *Blood* he then bore about with him. In *verse* 61, 62, 63. *Does this offend you* (saith he to them) *what and if you shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before* (then my particular *natural* Body will be far enough removed from you, and your selves then from so gross a conceit as to think I understand this of my *natural*, particular Body or *Flesh*.) No, says he, *the flesh profiteth nothing, it is the spirit that quickens; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life*, that is to say, they are concerning that *spiritual* Body and *Life* or *Spirit* that accompanies it (That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit) the both seed and nourishment of those that are *Regenerate*; the Principles of their *Regeneration*, and the *Divine* Food for their *Nutrition*, whereby they grow up to their due stature in *Christ*.

6. And where, or where so fully is this *Divine* Food to be had, as in that most solemn and most devotional approaching God in the Celebration of the *Communion* of the Body and Blood of *Christ*, where we both testify and advance thereby our *spiritual* union with him, according as he has declared in *John* ch. 6. *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* Upon which our *Communion-Service* thus glosses: That if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive this Holy Sacrament,

Sacrament, we then spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink his Blood, we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we are one with Christ and Christ with us. And whereas the Adversaries of our Church object, We cannot eat the Flesh of Christ and drink his Blood, in the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, unless his Flesh and Blood be really present; we do acknowledge that *that* Flesh and Blood which our Saviour discourses of in *S^t John*, and which our *Liturgie* alludes to, as also those notable sayings of the Fathers above cited out of the *Homily*, touching the *worthy receiving the Lord's Supper*, is really present in the Eucharist. And that there is that which Christ calls his *Flesh* and *Blood*, distinct from that which he then bore about with him, and was crucified on the Cross, he does most manifestly declare in that Discourse in *S^t John*, as I have already proved. So manifest is it, that the *Real Presence* does not imply any *Transubstantiation* of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ.

CHAP. II.

1. *The Bishop of Meaux his establishing Transubstantiation upon the literal sense of [This is my Body].*
2. *That according to the literal sense, the Bread that Christ blessed was both Bread and the Body of Christ at once, and that the avoiding that absurdity cast them upon Transubstantiation.*
3. *That Transubstantiation exceeds that avoided Absurdity, as contradicting the Senses as well as Reason, and labouring under the same Absurdity it self.*
4. *Further Reasons why the Road of the literal sense is to be left, and that we are to strike into*

into the Figurative, the former contradicting the Principles of Physicks, 5. Of Metaphysicks, 6. Of Mathematicks, 7. And of Logick. 8. That Transubstantiation implies, the same thing is and is not at the same time. 9. A number of Absurdities plainly resulting from Transubstantiation.

1. **A**ND therefore to prop up this great mistake of *Transubstantiation*, they are fain to recur and stick to a *literal sense* of those words of our Saviour [This is my Body] which I finding no where more handsomely done than by the Right Reverend Bishop of *Meaux*, I shall produce the Passage in his own words (that is, the translation of them) in his *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*, Sect. 10. The Real Presence, says he, of the Body and Blood of our Saviour is solidly established by the words of the Institution [This is my Body] which we understand *literally*; and there is no more reason to ask us why we fix our selves to the proper and *literal sense*, than there is to ask a Traveller why he follows the *high Road*. It is their parts who have recourse to the *Figurative sense*, and who take by-paths, to give a reason for what they do. As for us, since we find nothing in the words which Jesus Christ makes use of for the Institution of this Mystery, obliging us to take them in a *Figurative sense*, we think that to be a sufficient Reason to determine us to the *literal*.

2. In answer to this, I shall, if it be not too great a Presumption, first accompany this venerable Person in this *high Road* of the *literal sense* of the words of Institution [This is my Body] and then shew how this *Road*, as fairly as it looks, is here a mere *Angiportus* that hath no *exitus* or Passage, so that we must be forced to divert out of it, or go back again.

First then, let us take this supposed *high Road*, and say, the words [This is my Body] are to be understood *literally*. Wherefore let us produce the whole Text, and follow this kind of Gloss, *Luke 22. 19. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my Body, which is given for you, This do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.* Now if we keep to the mere *literal* sense, *This Cup* (as well as, *This Bread* is the Body of Christ) must be really the *New Testament* in Christ's Blood, which is a thing unavoidable if we tie our selves to the *literal* sense of the words. But why is not the *Cup*, the *Bloud* or *Covenant* in Christ's Blood? but that a *Cup* and *Bloud* are *Disparata*, or in general, *Opposita*, which to affirm one of another is a Contradiction; as if one should say, a *Bear* is a *Horse*: and therefore we are constrained to leave the *literal* sense, and to recur to a *figurative*. But precisely to keep to the institution of that part of the Sacrament that respects Christ's Body; It is plain that what he took he gave thanks for, what he gave thanks for he brake; what he brake he gave to his Disciples, saying, *This* (which he took, gave thanks for, brake, and gave to his Disciples, viz. the above-mentioned Bread) *is my Body*. Wherefore the *literal* sense must necessarily be, *This Bread* (as before it was *This Cup*,) *is my Body*. Inſomuch that according to this *literal* sense it is both *really Bread* still, and *really the Body of Christ* at once. Which, I believe, there is no *Romanist* but will be ashamed to admit. But why cannot he admit this but that *Bread* and the *Body of Christ* are *Opposita*, and therefore the one cannot be said to be the other without a perfect repugnancy or contradiction to humane Reason; as
absurd.

absurd as if one should say, a *Bear* is a *Horse*, or a *Rose* a *Black-bird*; whence, by the bye, we may note the necessary use of Reason in Matters of Religion, and that what is a plain *Contradiction* to humane Reason, such as, a *Triangle* is a *Circle*, or a *Cow* an *Horse*, are not to be admitted for Articles of the Christian Faith. And for this Reason, I suppose, the Church of *Rome* fell into the Opinion of *Transubstantiation*, (from this *literal* way of expounding these words [This is my Body]) rather than according to the genuine leading of that way, they would admit, that what Christ gave his Disciples, was both *real Bread* and the *real Body* of Christ at once.

3. But see the infelicity of this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which does not only contradict the inviolable Principles of *Reason* in humane Souls, but also all the *outward* senses, upon which account it is more intolerable than that Opinion which they seem so much to abhor, as to prefer *Transubstantiation* before it, though it contradict only *Reason*, not the *outward Senses*, which rightly circumstantiated are fit Judges touching sensible Objects, whether they be this or that, Fish or Fowl, Bread or Flesh. Nay I may add, That these Transubstantiators have fallen over and above that contradiction to the rightly circumstantiated senses, into *that very absurdity*, that they seemed so much to abhor from, that is, the confounding two *opposite Species* into one *Individual Substance*, viz. that one and the same Individual Substance should be really both *Bread* and *Christ's Body* at once. But by their transubstantiating the *Individual Substance* of the *Bread* into the *Individual Substance* of *Christ's Body*, they run into this very Repugnancy which they seemed before so cautiously to avoid; two Individual Substances (as *species infimæ*) being

Opposita, and therefore incapable of being said to be the same, or to be pronounced one of the other without a *Contradiction*. It is impossible that the Soul of *Socrates*, for example, should be so transubstantiated into the Soul of *Plato*, that it should become his Soul, inasmuch that it may be said of *Socrates's* Soul, that it is the Soul of *Plato*; and there is the same Reason of transubstantiating the Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ. So that the *Substance* of the Bread may be said to be the *Body* of Christ, or the *Substance* of his Body, which it must either be, or be *annihilated*, and then it is not the *Transubstantiation* of the *Substance* of the Bread, but the *Annihilation* of it, into the *Body* of Christ.

4. And having rid in this fair-promising *Road* of the *literal* sense, but thus far, I conceive, I have made it manifest, that it is not *passable*, but that we have discovered such difficulties as may very well move me to strike out of it, or return back. And further, to shew I do it not rashly, I shall add several other Reasons, as this venerable Person (that thinks fittest to keep in it still) doth but rightfully require; as declaring, It is their parts who have recourse to the *Figurative* sense, and who take by-paths, to give a reason why they do so. Wherefore besides what I have produced already, I add these, transcribed out of a Treatise of mine, writ many years ago. Besides then the Repugnancy of this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* to the common sense of all men, according to which it cannot but be judged to be Bread still, I shall now shew how it contradicts the Principles of all *Arts* and *Sciences* (which if we may not make use of in Theology, to what great purpose are all the Universities in *Christendom*?) the Principles, I say, of *Physicks*, of *Metaphysicks*, of *Mathematicks*, and of *Logick*.

Logick. It is a Principle in *Physicks*, That that Internal space or place that a Body occupies, is equal to the Body that occupies it. Now let us suppose, that one and the same Body occupies *two* such internal places or spaces at once. This Body therefore is equal to two spaces which are double to one single space; wherefore the Body is double to that Body in one single space, and therefore one and the same Body double to *it self*, which is an enormous *Contradiction*.

5. Again in *Metaphysicks*, the body of Christ is acknowledged *one*, and that as much as any one body else in the World. Now the *Metaphysical* Notion of [one] is to be *indivisum à se* (both *quoad partes* and *quoad totum*) as well as *divisum à quolibet alio*; but the body of Christ being both in Heaven, and without any continuance of that body, here upon Earth also, the whole body is divided from the whole body, and therefore is entirely both *unum* and *multa*, which is a perfect contradiction.

6. Thirdly, In the *Mathematicks* (*Concil. Trident. Sess. 13.*) the Council of *Trent* saying, that in the separation of the parts of the *species* (that which bears the outward show of Bread and Wine) that from this division there is a parting of the whole, divided into so many *entire* bodies of Christ, the body of Christ being always at the same time equal to it self; It follows, that a *part* of the division is *equal* to the *whole* that is divided, against that common Notion in *Euclid*, That the whole is bigger than the part.

7. And lastly, In *Logick*, it is a Maxim, That the parts agree indeed with the whole, but disagree one with another; but in the abovesaid division of the Host or Sacrament, the parts do so well agree, that they are intirely the *same individual thing*. And
whereas

whereas any Division, whether *Logical* or *Physical*, is the Division of some *one* into *many*, this is but the Division of *one* into *one* and *it self*, which is a perfect contradiction.

8. To all which you may add, That the *Transubstantiation* of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ implies, that the same thing both *is* and *is not* at the *same time* (which is against that Fundamental Principle in *Logick* and *Metaphysicks*, that both parts of a contradiction cannot be true) which I prove thus. For that *Individual* thing that can be made, or is to be made of any thing, is not; the progress in this case being, à *privatione ad habitum*, as the Schools speak, and the terms of Generation or of being made, *viz.* à *quo* and *ad quem* being *Non esse* and *Esse*, or *Non-existent* and *Existent*; so that that passing, is from *Non-existent* to *Existent*. Now the *individual* body of Christ is to be made of the Wafer consecrated, for it is turned into his *Individual* Body. But his *Individual* Body was before this Consecration; wherefore it both *was* and *was not* at the same time. For in the making thereof there was a passing from the *terminus à quo*, which is the *Non-existency* of the thing to be made, to the *terminus ad quem*, to the *Existency* of it, which yet was in Being before.

9. These difficulties are sufficient to shew that this high Road of the *literal* sense taken to establish *Transubstantiation* is not passable, so that there is a necessity of diverting or going back. Nor will it be much needful to hint briefly these or other like absurdities more intelligible to the *vulgar* capacity, such as, That the same Body at the same time is greater and lesser than it self; Is but a foot distant from me or less, and yet many thousand miles distant from me: That

That one and the same Person may be intirely present with himself, and some hundred thousand miles absent from himself at once: That he may sit still on the Grass, and yet journey and walk at the same time: That an organized body that hath head, feet, hands, &c. is intirely in every part of it self, the comely parts in the more uncomely: That the same Body now in Heaven may really present it self on Earth without passing any space either directly or circuitously: That our Saviour Christ *communicating* with his Disciples in the last Supper, swallowed down his whole intire Body, limbs, back, belly, head and mouth and all into his stomach, which might amuze and puzzle one to conceive how it was possible for his Disciples not to miss the sight of his hands and head, though his cloaths were still visible as not being swallowed down into his stomach. Or, whether our Saviour swallowed down his own Body into his stomach or no, this puzzle will still remain, how his Disciples could swallow him down without his cloathes, he being still in his cloaths; or how they could swallow him down in his cloaths, the bread being not transubstantiated into his cloaths, but into his body only. These and several such Absurdities it were easie to enumerate. But I hope I have produced so much already, that I may, and any one else, be thought to have very good cause to leave this *high Road* of the *literal* sense, and betake our selves to that more safe path of the *Figurative*, whereby *Transubstantiation* with all its Absurdities is avoided.

CHAP. III.

1. *An evasion of the Incredibility of Transubstantiation drawn from the Omnipotency of God.* 2. *Ans. That it is no derogation to God's Omnipotency not to be able to do what it implies a contradiction to be done.* 3. *If this Transubstantiation had been fecible; yet it had been repugnant to the Goodness and Wisdom of Christ to have effected it.* 4. *A marvellous witty device of taking away all the Absurdities of Transubstantiation, by giving to Christ's Body a supernatural manner of existence.* 5. *That the neat Artifice of this Sophistry lies in putting the smooth term of supernatural for counter-essential or asystatal.* 6. *That it is an Asystatal manner of Existence, proved from the Author's description thereof in several particulars. Arguments from the multiplication of Christ's Body, and difference of time of its production.* 7. *From Non-extension of parts.* 8. *From Independency of place.* 9. *To make a body independent of Place as unconceivable as to make it independent of Time.* 10. *The Argument from being whole in every part of the Symbols.*

1. **O**UT of which Absurdities the most witty evasion offered to our consideration that I have met with, is in that ingenious and artfully composed Treatise, entitled, *A Papist mis-represented and represented.* In his Chapter of the Eucharist toward the end, it is well worth the transcribing that I may offer some brief Answers to the things there comprized. "The Papist represented, saith he (pag. 11. lin. " 22.) not at all hearkning to his Senses in a matter
" where

" where God speaks ; he unfeignedly confesses, that
" he that made the World of nothing by his sole
" Word, That cured Diseases by his Word, That
" raised the Dead by his Word, That expell'd Devils,
" That commanded the Winds and Seas, That mul-
" tiplied Bread, That changed Water into Wine by
" his Word, and Sinners into Just Men, cannot want
" Power to change Bread and Wine into his own
" Body and Blood by his sole Word.

2. It is an invidious thing to dispute the Power of the Eternal *Logos* or *Word Incarnate*, who is God of God, very God of very God, and therefore *Omnipotent*, and can do all things that imply no *Contradiction* to be done, as most certainly none of these things there specify'd do imply it. But things repugnant to be done, we may, and that with due reverence, declare God cannot do. As the Apostle does not stick to say, *God cannot lie*, Heb. 6. 18. And why is it impossible for God to lye, but that it is *repugnant* to the Perfection of his Nature, and particularly that Attribute of his *Veracity*? Nor will any adventure to affirm that he can make a Globe or Cylinder which shall be equidistant from, or touch a Plane though but in half of their Spherical or Cylindrical Superficies: or a Circle from whose Center the lines drawn shall be unequal, or a Rectangle Triangle, the Power of whose *Hypotenusa* shall not be equal to both the Powers of the *Basis* and *Cathetus*. And in fine, there are fixt and immutable Idea's of things, and such necessary and inseparable respects and properties of them, that to imagine them *mutable*, or that God can change them, is to disorder and change the *Eternal* and *Immutable* Intellect of God himself. Of which those indeleble and necessary Notions, which the minds of all mankind are conscious to

D

themselves

themselves of, if they be but awakened into free attention thereto, is but a compendious *Transcript*.

And therefore God his being not able to do any thing that is a *Contradiction* to those Eternal Ideas and Habitudes of them in his own mind, is no lessening of his *Omnipotency*; but to imagine otherwise, is to dissolve the Eternal Frame of the Divine Intellect, and under a pretence of amplifying his *Omnipotency*, to enable God to *destroy himself*, or to make him so weak or *impotent* as to be capable of being destroyed by himself, which is a thing impossible.

3. But suppose the *Eternal Word Incarnate* could have turned the Bread and Wine into his own *Individual Body and Bloud*, and the thing it self were feasible, though it seems so palpably contradictory to us: yet there would be this difficulty still remaining, that it is repugnant to his *Wisdom* and *Goodness* so to do (as the Apostle says, it is impossible for God to lye) in that manner he is supposed to have done it, that is, in declaring a thing is done that is repugnant so apparently to our Intellectual Faculties, and leaves so palpable an assurance to all our Senses, though never so rightly *circumstantiated*, that it is not done, but that it is *still Bread*; and yet that these *species* of Bread and Wine should be supported by a Miracle, to obfirm or harden us in our unbelief of this Mystery of *Transubstantiation*. How does this suite with either the *Wisdom* of God, if he would in good earnest have us to believe this Mystery; or with his *Goodness*, to give this Scandal to the World, for whom Christ died, and to occasion so bloody Persecutions of innumerable innocent Souls, that could not believe a thing so contrary to all Sense and Reason, and indeed to Passages of Scripture it self, whose Pen-men he did inspire? Wherefore this is a plain

plain Evincement, that our Saviour meant *figuratively* when he said [This is my Body] and that his Disciples understood him so (there being nothing more usual in the Jewish Language than to call the *Sign* by the *Name* of the thing *signified*) and that this *literal* Gloss has been introduced by After-ages without any fault of our Saviour. But in defence of the *literal* sense which he would have to infer *Transubstantiation*, our Author holds on thus, *viz.*

4. "That this may be done without danger of
"multiplying his Body, and making as many Christs
"as Altars, or leaving the right hand of his Father,
"but only by giving to his Body a *Supernatural manner*
"of *Existence*, by which being left without *Extension*
"of *Parts*, and rendred *independent of Place*, it may be
"one and the same in *many* places at *once*, and *whole*
"in every *part* of the Symbols, and not obnoxious
"to any Corporeal Contingencies. And this kind of
"Existence is no more than what in a manner he be-
"stows upon every *glorified* Body, than what his
"own Body had when born without the least violation
"of his Mother's Virginal Integrity; when he rose
"from the Dead out of the Sepulchre without re-
"moving the stone; when he entered amongst his
"Disciples, the Doors being shut.

5. This is, as I said, a witty contrived evasion to e-
clude the above-mentioned Repugnancies I have noted,
and exquisitely well fitted for the amusing and con-
founding of more vulgar and weak minds, or such
as have not leisure to consider things to the bottom,
and for the captivating them into a profession of what
they have no determinate or distinct apprehension of,
by *distinctions* and *exemplifications* that give no real sup-
port to the cause they are brought in for to maintain.

For first, to pretend that by a *supernatural manner*

of *Existence* a Body may be in more places than one at once, at the right hand of God the Father in Heaven, and on the Altar at the same time, &c. The Artifice of the Sophistry lies in this, that he has put a more *tolerable* and *soft* expression in lieu of one that (according to his explication of the matter) would found more *harsh*, but is more *true* and *proper* in this case. For this manner of Existence of a Body which he describes is not simply *supernatural*, which implies it is a Body still, as a Mill-stone by a supernatural power held up in the Air is a Mill-stone still, though it be in that supernatural condition: But the condition he describes is such, as is not only *supernatural* but *counter-essential* or *Asystatal*, that is, *Repugnant* to the very Being of a Body, or of any finite substance in the Universe. It is as if the Mill stone were not only *supernaturally* supported in the Air, but were as *transparent*, as *soft* and *fluid*, and of as undetermined a shape as the Air it self, or as if a right-angled Triangle were declared to be so still, though the *Hypotenusa* were not of equal power with the *Basis* and *Cathetus*, which is a thing impossible: But if instead of a *supernatural manner of existence*, it had been said, an *Asystatal* manner of existence, that is, an Existence repugnant to the very Being of a Body or any finite substance else, it would have been discovered to be a contradiction at the very first sight, and therefore such as ought to be rejected, as well as the affirming that what Christ gave was *really Bread* and *really his Body at once*.

6. And now, notwithstanding this *soft* and *smooth* term of [supernatural] that it is an *Asystatal* manner of Existence, that is here given to the Body of Christ, may appear from our Author's description thereof. For in virtue, he saith, of this *supernatural manner of existence*,

existence, there may be a *Transubstantiation* without danger of *multiplying* Christ's Body, and making as many Christs as Altars. But it is impossible this Absurdity should be avoided, supposing *Transubstantiation*. For there is not a more certain and infallible sign of two bodily Persons being *two* bodily Persons, and not the *same* Person, than distance of Place, wherein they are separate one from another, and consequently *two*, not *one* Body; and this is the very case in *Transubstantiation*, which manifestly implies, that the Body of Christ is in many thousand distant places at once. Which imagined condition in it is not *supernatural* but *Axytatal*, and *contradictious* to the very Being of any finite substance whatever, as has been intimated and firmly proved before, *Chap. 2.*

And as *distance of place* necessarily infers difference of Bodies or Persons, so does also *difference of time* of their *Production*. That which was produced, suppose sixteen hundred Years ago, and remains so produced, cannot be produced suppose but yesterday, or at this present moment, and so be sixteen hundred Years older or younger than it self. This is not only *supernatural* but *Axytatal*, and implies a perfect contradiction; but yet this is the very case in *Transubstantiation*. The Body of Christ born suppose sixteen hundred Years ago, is yet produced out of the *Transubstantiated* Bread but now or yesterday, and so the same Body is sixteen hundred Years older or younger than it self, which is a perfect *Contradiction*.

7. Secondly, The Papist represented declares, That the Body of Christ by virtue of this *supernatural manner of Existence*, is left without *Extension of Parts*, which is a perfect contradiction to the very nature and essence of a Body, whose universally acknowledged Definition is *τὸ τελεχῇ διάστημα αὐτῆς*, implying

plying a *Trinal impenetrable dimension* or extension. Besides, did Christ's Body at his last Supper, so soon as he had *Transubstantiated* the Bread into it, lose all extension of parts? What then filled out his cloaths as he sat with his Disciples at Table? or how could the Jews lay hold on Christ's Body to Crucifie it, if he had no extension of parts to be laid hold on? How could there be hands and feet and organization of parts, either at the *Table* or on the *Cross*, if there were no extension of parts to be organized? And lastly, being the *Transubstantiated* Bread is the very *Individual* Body of Christ, if they would have this being left without extension of parts, to be understood of it, how can the very same *Individual* Body of Christ have Extension of Parts and have no Extension of Parts, have Organization of Parts and have no Organization of Parts at once? So that the condition of Christ's Body here supposed is plainly *Assistat*, not as is *smoothly* expressed only *Supernatural*.

8. Thirdly, Whereas the *Papist* Represented declares, that this *Supernatural* Manner of Existence of Christ's Body renders it *Independent of Place*, what can the meaning of that be, but that by vertue of this priviledge it might exist without any *Place* or *Ubi*, which Bodies in their natural condition cannot? But this clashes with the very Story of our Saviour Christ, who was certainly in the Room in which he ate the Passover with his Disciples, after he had *transubstantiated* Bread into his *Individual* Body, and therefore it did not exist *Independently of Place* in virtue of any such *Supernatural Manner of Existence* as is imagined. And as this does not agree with matter of Fact, so it is a perfect contradiction to the Essence of any Body or finite Substance to be exempted from all connexion with *Place* or *Ubi*, but a *finite* Substance must be in a
definite

definite Ubi, and while it is in such a definite *Ubi*, it is impossible to conceive that it is in another *Place* or *Ubi*, whether *intra* or *extra mœnia Mundi*. He that closely and precisely considers the point, he will not fail, I think, to discern the thing to be impossible. And what contradiction it implies, I have demonstrated above. So that we see there can be no such *Supernatural Manner* of Existence conferred on a Body in making it *independent* of *Place* or *Ubiety*, as to capacitate it to be one and the same Body in diverse places at once; but that this supposed *Supernatural Manner* is truly an *Assystatal Manner*, and such as is repugnant to the very *Being* of a *Body*, or any *finite Substance* whatsoever.

9. To make a body in this sense *independent* of *Place* or *Ubiety*, is as unconceivable as to make it *independent* of *Time*, which yet would so compleat this impossible *Hypothesis*, that under this pretence when a thing has such a *Supernatural Existence* as exempts it from all connexion with or relation to *Time*, but supposes it utterly independent thereof, as was explained before touching *Place*, we may suppose what we will of a *Body*, that it may be *Bread* and *not Bread* at the same time, that it may be at *Thebes* and at *Athens* at the same time, as we ordinary mortals would phrase it, sith it is lifted up above all Relation and Connexion with *Time*, nor hath any thing to do with any *Time*. But yet this assuredly is not a mere *Supernatural Manner of Existence*, but plainly *Assystatal*, and such as if God could cause, there would be no *Eternal* and *Immutable Truths*, but under a Pretext of exalting the *Omnipotence* of God, they would imply him able to destroy his own *Nature*, which would argue an *Impotency* in him, and to extinguish and confound the *Inviolable Idea's* of the *Divine Intellect*; as I intimated above.

10. And

plying a *Trinal impenetrable dimension* or extension. Besides, did Christ's Body at his last Supper, so soon as he had *Transubstantiated* the Bread into it, lose all extension of parts? What then filled out his cloaths as he sat with his Disciples at Table? or how could the Jews lay hold on Christ's Body to Crucifie it, if he had no extension of parts to be laid hold on? How could there be hands and feet and organization of parts, either at the *Table* or on the *Cross*, if there were no extension of parts to be organized? And lastly, being the *Transubstantiated* Bread is the very *Individual* Body of Christ, if they would have this being left without extension of parts, to be understood of it, how can the very same *Individual* Body of Christ have Extension of Parts and have no Extension of Parts, have Organization of Parts and have no Organization of Parts at once? So that the condition of Christ's Body here supposed is plainly *Assistat*, not as is *smoothly* exprest only *Supernatural*.

8. Thirdly, Whereas the *Papist* Represented declares, that this *Supernatural* Manner of Existence of Christ's Body renders it *Independent of Place*, what can the meaning of that be, but that by virtue of this privilege it might exist without any *Place* or *Ubi*, which Bodies in their natural condition cannot? But this clashes with the very Story of our Saviour Christ, who was certainly in the Room in which he ate the Passover with his Disciples, after he had *transubstantiated* Bread into his *Individual* Body, and therefore it did not exist *Independently of Place* in virtue of any such *Supernatural Manner of Existence* as is imagined. And as this does not agree with matter of Fact, so it is a perfect contradiction to the Essence of any Body or finite Substance to be exempted from all connexion with *Place* or *Ubi*, but a *finite* Substance must be in a
definite

definite Ubi, and while it is in such a definite *Ubi*, it is impossible to conceive that it is in another *Place* or *Ubi*, whether *intra* or *extra mania Mundi*. He that closely and precisely considers the point, he will not fail, I think, to discern the thing to be impossible. And what contradiction it implies, I have demonstrated above. So that we see there can be no such *Supernatural Manner* of Existence conferred on a Body in making it *independent* of *Place* or *Ubiety*, as to capacitate it to be one and the same Body in diverse places at once; but that this supposed *Supernatural Manner* is truly an *Afysfatal Manner*, and such as is repugnant to the very *Being* of a *Body*, or any *finite Substance* whatsoever.

9. To make a body in this sense *independent* of *Place* or *Ubiety*, is as unconceivable as to make it *independent* of *Time*, which yet would so compleat this impossible *Hypothesis*, that under this pretence when a thing has such a *Supernatural Existence* as exempts it from all connexion with or relation to *Time*, but supposes it utterly independent thereof, as was explained before touching *Place*, we may suppose what we will of a *Body*, that it may be *Bread* and *not Bread* at the same time, that it may be at *Thebes* and at *Athens* at the same time, as we ordinary mortals would phrase it, sith it is lifted up above all Relation and Connexion with *Time*, nor hath any thing to do with any *Time*. But yet this assuredly is not a mere *Supernatural Manner of Existence*, but plainly *Afysfatal*, and such as if God could cause, there would be no *Eternal* and *Immutable Truths*, but under a *Pretext* of exalting the *Omnipotence* of God, they would imply him able to *destroy his own Nature*, which would argue an *Impotency* in him, and to *extinguish* and *confound* the *Inviolable Idea's* of the *Divine Intellect*, as I intimated above.

10. And

10. And, Fourthly and lastly, That in vertue of this *Supernatural Manner of Existence*, the Body of Christ should be *whole* in every part of the Symbols, and thereby become not obnoxious to any corporeal Contingences; (which is said, I suppose, to avoid the Absurdity of grinding a pieces the Body of Christ with our Teeth when we chew the supposed Species) thus to exist *whole in every part*, is not a mere *Supernatural Manner of Existing*, but *Aysstatal*, and implies either that the least part of Christ's Body is as big as the whole, or that the whole Body is God knows how many thousand times bigger than it self. For certainly the whole Body comprized under the whole *Bread* or Species of Bread, is many thousand times bigger than one particle thereof no bigger than a Pins point. Besides that this making the Body of Christ *whole in every part*, takes away all possibility of distinct *Organization* of his Body, unless you will have every Pins point of it to have Head, Feet, Hands, Arms, and the rest of the Parts of an humane Body, or have the same *Individual Body organized and unorganized* at the same time, which are as palpable *Contradictions* as any can occur to the understanding of a man.

And thus much I thought fit to intimate touching this Witty Distinction of a *Natural* and *Supernatural Manner of Existence of a Body*, and to shew that this pretended *Supernatural Manner* of the Existence of Christ's Body, arising from the Bread *transubstantiated*, as the *Papist Represented* describes it, is indeed an *Aysstatal Manner of Existence*, and *inconsistent* with the Being of any Body, or *finite Substance* whatsoever.

CHAP. IV.

1. *The Supernatural Manner of the Existence of a Body consisting in Non-extension of Parts, Independency of Place, and being whole in every Part.* 2. *The first exemplification of such a Manner of Existence in Glorified Bodies, not to reach the Case.* 3. *Nor the second, in Christ's Body born without the least Violation of his Mothers Virginal Integrity.* 4. *Nor the third, in Christ's rising out of the Sepulcher without the removing of the stone.* 5. *Nor the fourth, in Christ's entering amongst his Disciples the doors being shut.* 6. *Transubstantiation implying a number of contradictions as harsh as that of the same body being both Christ's Body and Bread at once, and there being no salvo for them but this device of a supernatural manner of Existence, and this so plainly failing, it is impossible that Transubstantiation should be the true mode of the Real Presence.*

1. **I**T remains now that we only touch upon lightly the exemplifications of this supernatural manner of Existence of a Body, consisting in these peculiarities, *Non-extension of parts, Independency of Place, and being whole in every part*, and to note how none of these instances reach the present case.

2. As first that of a glorified Body. What Scripture, Reason or Authority ever suggested to us that the glorified Body of Christ himself, much less every glorified Body, is without *extension of parts*, has no relation to or connexion with *Place*, or is *whole in every part*? For without extension of Parts it cannot be so much as a *Body*. And were not *Moses* and *Elias* together with Christ at his Transfiguration on

E

Mount

Mount Tabor, at least *lively Figures* of the state of a *glorified Body*? but it is evident by the description, that they had extension of parts, else what should shining Garments do upon what is unextended, and what glory can issue from a single Mathematical point as I may so call it? And in that they were on Mount Tabor together, it is manifest they had a connexion with or dependency on *Place*, nor did exist without being in some *ubi*. And that the glorified Body of Christ is in Heaven not on Earth, is plain from *Act. 3. 21*. And touching his Body he rose in, and therefore was his Resurrection Body, *Matt. 28. 6*. the Angel says, *He is not here, for he is risen*; which had been a mere *Non sequitur*, if his Body could have been in more places than one at once, which property the *Papist* represented gives it upon account of *Transubstantiation*. And for as much as the *Transubstantiated Bread* and the Body of Christ is one and the same *Individual Body*, and that this that is once Christ's Body never perishes, it is evident, that the Body he rose in, being one and the same Body with the *Transubstantiated Bread*, must have the capacity by this *supernatural manner of Existence* above described, to be in more places than one at once, which is a perfect contradiction to the Angels reasoning: *He is not here, for he is risen*, and gone hence. For according to this *supernatural manner of Existence*, which they suppose in Christ's Body upon the account of *Transubstantiation*, he might be both there and gone thence at once.

3. The Second Instance of this *supernatural manner of existence* of a Body, is Christ's Body born without the least violation of his Mothers Virginal Integrity, which is such a secret as the Scripture has not revealed, nor any sufficient Authority assured us of: The
Mother.

Mother of Christ still continuing a Virgin, because she had nothing to do with any *man*, though that which was conceived in her by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost came out of her Womb in the same circumstances there, that other humane Births do. But suppose the Body of Christ pass'd the wicket of the Womb without opening it, as the Sun-beams pass through a Crystal or Glass, does this import that his Body is either *Independent* of Place, or is devoid of *Extension*, or *whole* in every *Part*? surely no, no more than that light that passes through the pores of the Crystal: so that there is nothing repugnant to the nature of a Body in all this. No *Non-extension*, no *Independency* of Place, no *penetration* of corporeal *Dimensions*, nor any being *whole* in every *part*.

4. The Third Instance is Christ's rising out of the Sepulcher *without removing the Stone*. But this Instance may very justly be rejected, it disagreeing with the very History of the *Resurrection*, which tells us the *Stone was removed*, Matt. 28. 2. *And behold there was a great Earthquake, for the Angel descended from Heaven, and rolled back the Stone from the door, and sat upon it*. Wherefore we see the Stone was removed. Nor can I imagine why this should make a third Instance, *viz.* Christ's Body passing out of the Sepulcher, the Stone unremoved from the door thereof, unless from an heedless reflection on the fore-going verse (where *Mary Magdalen* and the other *Mary* are said to go to see the Sepulcher) and connecting it to an ill grounded sense with what follows in the second verse, *And behold there was a great Earthquake*; as if it were implied that the Earthquake and the rolling away the Stone were at that very time that these two Women went to see the Sepulcher, and Christ having risen before, that it would follow that he rose before the Stone of

the Sepulcher was removed ; but this is a mistake. For agreeably to *Vatablus* his Gloss (who for *erat* [*& ecce erat terra motus magnus*] puts *fuerat*, and for *descendit*, *descenderat*, and for *devolvit lapidem*, *devolverat*) which implies the thing done before these Women came to the Sepulcher ; it is manifest out of the other Evangelists that the matter was altogether so ; for *Mark* 16. 2. it is said of the two-abovesaid parties, That very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the Sepulcher at the rising of the Sun, and they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the Stone from the door of the Sepulcher ? and when they looked they saw the Stone was rolled away, &c. And it is expressly said in *Luke*, That they found the Stone rolled away from the Sepulcher. And the like is recorded in *S^t John*, ch. 20. so that it is a plain case, the Stone was rolled away before their going to the Sepulcher.

What time therefore can we imagine more likely of this rolling away the Stone and terrible Earthquake, than at the very *Resurrection* of Christ, who rose in this awful terrour to the Keepers, the Earth quaking, and the two Glorious Angels officiously opening the stony door of the Sepulcher, that the King of glory might pass out, without any further needless or useles Miracle, such as he ever declined in his life time, before his Death and Resurrection ? Wherefore this third Instance, it is plain, cannot with any shew be accommodated to the present case, it being raised out of a mere mistake of the Story.

5. The Fourth and last Instance is, *Christ's entring amongst his Disciples, the doors being shut*, recorded *John* 20. 19, and 26. there the Disciples are said to be gathered together privately or secretly for fear of the *Jews*, for which cause they lockt or bolted the doors with-

with-inside, that no man might suddenly come upon them. But while they were in this privacy or closeness, Christ, notwithstanding, *suddenly* presented himself in the midst of them, for all this closeness or secrecy, and not without a Miracle, supposing himself or some ministring Angel to unlock or unbolt the door suddenly, and softly, *sine strepitu*, which upon this account would be more likely, in that if he had come in, the doors being still shut, that might have seemed as great an Argument to *Thomas* that he was a *Spirit*, as the feeling his Hands and Side that he was *no Spirit*. Wherefore, I conceive, it is no sufficiently firm Hypothesis, that Christ entred among his Disciples, the doors in the mean time, at his very entrance, remaining shut. But suppose they were so, this will not prove his Body devoid of *Extension*, to be *independent* of *Place*, and *whole in every part*, more than his passing the wicker of the Womb, like light through Crystal, did argue the same in the second Instance. But the truth of the business will then be this, That he being then in his *Resurrection-body* (even that where-with he was to ascend into Heaven, which yet he kept in its *Terrestrial* Modification, and Organization; for those services it was to do amongst his Disciples while he conversed with them after his Resurrection upon Earth; as he made use of it in a particular manner to *S^t Thomas*) he had a Power to modify it into what Consistencies he pleased, Aerial, *Ætherial*, or *Cœlestial*, it remaining still that *Individual* Body, that was crucified. This therefore might easily pass through the very Pores of the door, and much more easily betwixt the door and the sideposts there, without any inconvenience more than to other *Spiritual* Bodies. For the *Resurrection-body* is an Heavenly and *Spiritual* Body, as *S^t Paul* himself expressly declares.

But

But yet as truly a Body as any Body else; that is, it hath *impenetrable Trinal Dimension*, is not without *Place* or *Ubiquity*, nor *whole in every part*. This very Story demonstrates all this, That his Body is not *without Place*: For it stood in the midst of the Room amongst his Disciples. Nor the *whole in every part*; For here is distinct mention of Christ's Hand and his Side, as elsewhere of his Flesh and Bones, *Luke 24. 26.* which would be all confounded, if every part were in every part. And if there be these distinct parts, then certainly his Body hath *Extension*; and this ingeniously excogitated Distinction of the *Natural and Supernatural Manner of Existence* of a Body, can by no means cover the gross Repugnancies, which are necessarily imply'd in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

6. A Doctrine raised from the *literal* sense of those Words [This is my Body] which *literal* sense if we were tyed to, it would also follow that that which Christ gave to his Disciples was as well *Real Bread* as his *Real Body*: [This] plainly referring to what he took, what he blessed, and what he gave, which was *Bread*, and of *this* he says, *This is my Body*. Wherefore adhering to the *literal* sense, it would be both *Real Bread* and the *Real Body* of Christ at once. But this, as being a Repugnancy, as was noted above, and Contradiction to the known inviolable and immutable Laws of *Logick* and humane Reason, is justly rejected by the Church of *Rome*, for this very Reason, that it implies a Contradiction, that one and the same Body should be *Bread* and the *Real Body* of Christ at once. Wherefore *Transubstantiation* containing, as has been proved, so many of such Contradictions, every jot as repugnant to the inviolable and immutable Laws of *Logick*, or humane Reason

Reason (that unextinguishable Lamp of the Lord in the Soul of man) as this of the same Body being *Real Bread* and the *Real Body* of Christ at once: And there being no *Salvo* for these harsh Contradictions, but the pretence of a *Supernatural Manner of Existence* of a Body, which God is supposed to give to the Bread transubstantiated into the Body of Christ, that is, into the very *Individual Body* of Christ, they being supposed by *Transubstantiation* to become one and the same Body; I lay this neat distinction of a *Supernatural Manner of Existing* being plainly demonstrated (so as it is by the *Papist Represented*, explained) not to be a mere *Supernatural Manner of Existence*, with which the *Being* of a *Body* would yet consist, but a Counter-essential, Asystatal, and Repugnant manner of Existence, inconsistent with the *Being* of a *Body*; and none of the Instances that are produced as Pledges of the truth of the Notion or Assertion at all reaching the present Case, it is manifest, that though there be a Real Presence of Christ's Body and Bloud in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist, acknowledged as well by the Reformed as the Pontifical Party, that it is impossible that Transubstantiation, which the Papist represented here declares, should be the true mode thereof.

CHAP. V.

1. *The Author's excuse for his civility to the Papist Represented, that he shews him that the Road he is in is not the way of Truth touching the mode of the Real Presence.*
2. *That the Bishop of Meaux makes the Real Presence the common Doctrine of all the Churches*

as well Reformed as Un-reformed, and that it is acknowledged to be the Doctrine of the Church of England, though she is so wise and so modest as not to define the mode thereof. 3. The sincere Piety of our Predecessors in believing the Real Presence, and their unfortunateness afterwards in determining the mode by Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation.

1. **A**ND therefore the Papist Represented, being in so palpable a mistake, and by keeping to the *literal sense* having so apparently wandred from the path of Truth, I hope my thus industriously and carefully advertizing him thereof for his own good, will be no otherwise interpreted than an Act of Humanity or common Civility, if not of indispensable Christianity, thus of my own accord, though not *Roganti*, yet *Erranti comiter monstrare viam*, or at least to assure him that this of *Transubstantiation* is not the right Road to the due understanding of the manner or mode of the Real Presence of the Body and Bloud of Christ in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist.

2. Which Opinion of the Real Presence the Bishop of *Meaux* declares to be the Doctrine of all the Churches as well Reformed as Unreformed; as I must confess I have been of that perswasion (ever since I writ my Mystery of Godliness) that it is the Doctrine of the Church of England, and that the Doctrine is true. And this I remember I heard from a near Relation of mine when I was a Youth, a Reverend Dignitary of the Church of England, and that often, *viz.* That our Church was for the *Real Presence*, but for the manner thereof, if asked, he would answer, *Rem scimus, Modum nescimus*, We know the thing, but the mode or manner thereof we know not. And

And the assurance we have of the thing is from the common suffrage of the ancient Fathers, such as the above-cited place of our Homilies glances at, and from the Scripture it self, which impressed that Notion on the minds of our Pious Predecessors in the Church of God.

3. For I do verily believe, that out of mere Devotion and sincere Piety, and out of a Reverend esteem they had of the Solemnity of the Eucharist, they embraced this Doctrine as well as broached it at the first. And if they had kept to the profession of it in general, without running into *Transubstantiation* or *Consubstantiation*, and had defined no further than the plain Scriptural Text in the sixth of St. *John* and the Suffrages of the Primitive Fathers had warranted them, *viz.* That there was a twofold Body and Bloud of Christ, the one *Natural*, the other *Spiritual* or *Divine*, which we do really receive in the Holy Communion (within which limits I shall confine my self here without venturing into any farther curiosities) it had been more for the Peace and Honour of the Christian Church, and it might have prevented much scandal to them without, and much Cruelty and Persecution amongst our selves: The History of which is very horrid even to think of. But though there have been these Mistakes in declaring the Mode, yet the thing it self is not therefore to be abandoned, it being so great a Motive for a Reverend approaching the Lord's Table, and duly celebrating the Solemnity of the Holy Eucharist. Nor can we, as I humbly conceive, relinquish this Doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Bloud of Christ, without the declining the most *easie* and *natural* sense of the Holy Scripture, as it stands written in the sixth Chapter of St. *John*.

CHAP. VI.

1. Gratian his distinction of the Flesh and Blood of Christ into Spiritual or Divine, and into that Flesh that hung on the Cross, and that Blood let out by the Lance of the Souldier. 2. The same confirmed out of S. Austin, who makes the Body and Blood of Christ to be partaken of in Baptism, and also from S. Paul and Philo. 3. Other Citations out of Philo touching the Divine Logos agreeable with what Christ says of himself in his Discourse John 6. And out of which it further appears that the Antient Fathers ate the same Food that we, the Divine Body of Christ, but not that which hung on the Cross. 4. A strong Confirmation out of what has been produced, that Gratian his distinction is true. 5. The first Argument from our Saviour's Discourse, That he meant not his Flesh that hung on the Cross, because he says, that he that eats it has Eternal Life in him. 6. The second, because his Flesh and Blood is the Object of his Discourse, not the Manner of eating and drinking them. 7. The third, because of his answer to his murmuring Disciples, which removes his Natural Body far from them, and plainly tells them, The Flesh profiteth nothing. 8. Gratian's distinction no novel Doctrine.

1. **O**UT of which sixth Chapter of S^t John, that is manifest which a Member of the Roman Church herself, has declared, an eminent Canonist of theirs, Gratian, in [Canon dupliciter] as it is cited by Philippus Morneau, lib. 4. De Eucharistiâ, Cap. 8. Dupliciter intelligitur Caro Christi, & Sanguis: vel Spiritualis illa atque Divina de qua ipse dicit, Caro mea verè est

est Cibus, & Sanguis meus verè est Potus, & nisi manducaveritis Carnem meam, & biberitis Sanguinem meum, non habebitis Vitam Æternam; vel caro quæ Crucifixæ est, & sanguis qui militis effusus est lanceâ. I the rather take notice of this Passage, because he makes use of the very Phrases which I used without consulting him in my Philosophical Hypothesis of the great Mytery of Regeneration, calling that Body or Flesh which Christ so copiously discourses of *John 6. Spiritual or Divine*, which he plainly distinguishes, as Christ himself there does, from that Body that hung on the Cross, and that Blood that was let out by the lance of the Souldier.

2. For we cannot be *Regenerate* out of these in Baptism, and yet in the same place *S. Augustine* says, We are partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ in *Baptism*; and therefore as *Terrestrial* Animals are not fed (as they say the *Chameleon* is) of the Air, but by food of a *Terrestrial* Consistency, so our *Regeneration* being out of *spiritual* Principles, our inward man is also nourished by that Food that is *Spiritual or Divine*. And that is a marvellous passage of *S. Paul*, *1 Cor. 10.* where he says, *The Fathers did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ*, where *S. Austin, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas*, and others, as you may see in *Jacobus Capellus*, avouch, That the ancient Patriarchs ate the same *Spiritual Food* that we, which therefore must be the *Flesh and Blood of Christ*, in that sense Christ understands it in, *John 6.* And that passage of *Philo* (that *Grotius* notes on the same place) is worth our taking notice of, and that in two several Treatises of his he interprets the *Manna* of the *שֶׁמֶן הַזַּיִת*, the *Divine Logos*, which agrees hugely well with our
F 2 supposing

supposing that the Flesh and Bloud of which our Saviour saith, it is *meat indeed*, and *drink indeed*, he speaks this as he is the *Eternal Logos*, to whom appertains the universal *Divine Body*, as being the Body of his *Zōē*, *Life* or *Spirit*, as I have noted in my *Analytical* account of the forepart of the first Chapter of *S^t John's Gospel*. See my *Scholia* at the end of my *Enchiridium Ethicum*.

3. And it is marvellously applicable to our purpose what *Philo* says on that Passage of *Deuteronomy*, Chap. 32. ver. 5. *He made him to suck Honey out of the Rock, and Oyl out of the Flinty Rock* (in his Περὶ τοῦ τοῦ χείρου τοῦ κρείττονι φιλεῖν ὑπὸ θεοῦ) where he says the Rock signifies τὴν στέρεαν καὶ ἀδιάρητον σοφίαν Θεοῦ. *The solid, steady and infrangible Wisdom of God*; implying the *Immutableness* and *Unalterableness* of the Natures, Properties, and Respects of the *Idea's* of things in the *Divine Intellect*, The τὰ αἰὲν αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχοντα, not to be changed or violated for any superstitious purposes whatsoever, as I have intimated before. Wherefore as *S^t Paul* calls *Christ*, who is the *Eternal Logos*, a Rock, so does *Philo*, by saying, that Rock *Moses* mentions in his Song is the *steady, solid and infrangible Wisdom of God*. Which therefore is that *Essential Wisdom*, the same that the *Divine Logos*, or second *Hypostasis* of the Trinity.

And not many lines after in the same Treatise, the Lawgiver, says he, τὴν πέτραν ταύτην καλεῖ μάννα τὴν πρεσβυτάτην πρὸ ὅλων, λόγον θεῖον, calls this Rock *Manna the Divine Logos that was before all Beings*, and without whom nothing was made that was made, as *S^t John* testifies. And in his [Περὶ τοῦ τίς ὁ πρὸ θεῶν πεπραγμένων κληρονόμος.] speaking of *Israel*, which he would have signifie one that sees God: *He*, says he, *lifting up his Eyes to Heaven sees, and thence receives,*

*ceives, (τὸ μάννα ἢ θεῖον λόγον ἢ ὑψίστιον ἢ φιλοθεάμε-
 ρον ψυχῆς ἀφθάρτων τροφήν) the Manna, the Divine
 Logos, the Heavenly incorruptible Food of the Soul de-
 voted to Holy Speculation. Which Passages I could
 not forbear to produce, they having so great an Affi-
 nity with that which our Saviour professes of him-
 self, that he is this Bread from Heaven; the true
 Manna, and incorruptible Food of the Soul, whereby
 she is nourished to Eternal Life, John 6: Out of all
 which may be more easily understood how the Fa-
 thers did all eat the same Spiritual Meat, and drink
 the same Spiritual Drink, which cannot well be con-
 ceived but of such a Divine Body and Bloud of Christ,
 as is universal, not restrained to his particular humane
 Nature, but belonging to him as he is the Eternal
 Logos, in whom is the Ζωὴ Life or Spirit, which go-
 eth along with the Divine Body of this Life or Spirit
 of Christ, and consequently is rightly called his Body.
 Which being the necessary Principles of Regeneration
 (for *ex eisdem nutrimur ex quibus constamus*) and there-
 being no Salvation without Regeneration, and no Re-
 generation continued and advanced without congen-
 erous Food; we must necessarily conclude with Saint
 Paul, that, *The Fathers all ate the same Spiritual Meat,
 and drank all the same Spiritual Drink, Water, Honey,
 Oyl out of the same Rock, Christ, the Eternal Word
 or Logos. And certainly that Body and Bloud of
 Christ out of which the Fathers were Regenerate, and
 by which they were fed, cannot be the very Body
 and Bloud of Christ which hung on the Cross,
 and whose Bloud was there let out by the Lance of
 the Souldier that pierced his side: and therefore
 there was a Body and Bloud of Christ before he was
 incarnate, for the Regenerate Souls of the antient
 People of the Jews to feed upon, belonging to him as*
 he.*

he is the Eternal *Logos*; in whom is the Life and that Spirit of which it is said, That which is born of the Flesh is Flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Which things are more fully treated of in *Παλιγγενεσία*, or a Philosophical Hypothesis touching the great Mystery of Regeneration.

4. Wherefore there is all the Reason in the World, if not plain Necessary to admit, what we cited out of *Gratian* that famous *Canonist* of the Church of *Rome*, That we are to understand that there is a *twofold Flesh and Bloud of Christ*, either that *Spiritual and Divine Flesh*, of which he himself says, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Bloud is Drink indeed, and, Unless you eat my Flesh, and drink my Bloud, ye shall not have Everlasting Life; Or that Flesh* which was crucified, and *that Bloud* that was let out of his side by the *Lance of the Souldier*, which we shall now endeavour briefly to demonstrate out of that Discourse of our Saviour in the sixth of *S. John*.

5. First then, That the Flesh of Christ that hung once on the Cross, and into which the *Bread* of the *Romanists* is supposed to be *Transubstantiated* in the Sacrament of our Lord's Supper, is not the Flesh here meant, is plain from what is said thereof in this sixth Chapter of *S. John*, ver. 54. *Who so eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Bloud hath Eternal Life*. But every one that eateth the Bread transubstantiated into the Body of Christ, that once hung upon the Cross, in the *Roman* Communion, has not Eternal Life in him. Nay if that Souldier that pierced our Saviour's Side, and let out his Bloud with his Lance, had drunk also thereof, and cut some piece of his Flesh from his Body and eaten it, is any one so fond as to think, that he thereby would have been made Partaker of Eternal Life? But if Christ meant that Body

or

or *Flesh* of his and not some other that is rightly also called his *Flesh* or *Body*, it would follow, that that Souldier by doing that savage and inhumane act, would have obtained Everlasting Life. Wherefore it is plain from hence, that there is *another* *Body* or *Flesh* of Christ, and *another* *Bloud*, distinct from that *Bloud* that was shed on the Cross, and from that *Body* that hung there, which our Saviour aims at in his Discourse.

6. Secondly, It is plain that our Saviour's Discourse in that Chapter (he passing from that *temporal* Food which he had lately procured for the multitude, to a *Spiritual* and *Eternal*) has for its Object or Subject not the *Manner* or *Way* of receiving his *Body* and *Bloud*, as if it were meant of that very *Flesh* and *Bloud* on the Cross, but that it was to be received in a *Spiritual* *Manner*, which Interpreters, several of them, drive at ; but the Object of his Discourse is his very *Flesh* and *Bloud* it self, to be taken (as the Fish and Loaves were wherewith he lately fed them) or it is himself in reference to this *Flesh* and *Bloud* which belongs to him as he is the *Eternal Word*, and in this sense he says, *He is the Bread of God that cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life to the World*, ver. 33. And ver. 48. *Εγω ειμι το αριθρον τω ζωης, I am the Bread of Life*; and speaking of the *Manna* he presently adds, *Your Fathers ate Manna, and yet died*, viz. the natural Death, the natural *Manna* being no Preservative against the natural Death. And ver. 51. *Εγω ειμι ο αριθρος ο ζωης*, as before he called himself *αριθρος τω ζωης*. For in him is the *Zōē* (*John* 1.) or *Life* and *Spirit*, and this *Spirit* or *Life* in the *Divine Body*. I am the living Bread coming down from Heaven (as the *Manna* is said to do, and to which *Philo* compares the *Divine Logos*) if any one eat of this Bread he shall

shall live for ever. He speaks not of the *manner* of eating of it, but of the *Bread it self* to be eaten, and yet immediately thereupon he calls *this Bread* his *Flesh*, which he says, *he will give for the Life of the World*, that is, to the end that they may be enlivened thereby, he thus communicating to them his *Divine Body* and Spirit together. And then presently upon the Jews striving amongst themselves and saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? (the reason whereof was because they took him to be a *meer* man, and thought that Christ himself understood it of his *humane Flesh*) he affirms with greater earnestness and vehemency, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man (viz. of the Messias, who is the Logos incarnate) and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you. Whoso eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, hath Eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.* And so all along to the very end of his Discourse, he speaks of a *real eating his Flesh*, and *drinking his Blood*, not of the *Manner* of eating, as if it never came nigh them, but only they *thought* of *Flesh* and *Blood* God knows how far distant from them, and so ate the *humane* Flesh of Christ by meer thinking of it, and drank his Blood after the same *imaginary* Manner, which would I think, be a very *dilute* and *frigid* sense of such high and fervid Asseverations of our Saviour, if the Mystery reached no farther than so.

7. But Thirdly and lastly, That it does reach further than so, is exceeding evident from what our Saviour utters upon his Disciples being scandalized at this strange Discourse of his, *ver. 61. When Jesus knew in himself, that his Disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Does this offend you? What if you shall see the Son of man ascending where he was before?* which he must

must needs understand of his *particular* visible Body which he bore about with him, and which his humane Soul did actuate, and which was appropriated to his *humane* nature, which is *finite* and circumscribed. It is an *Elliptical* speech of his, but thus naturally to be supplied, as I have also noted above, as if he suppressed by an *Aposiopesis* this *objurgatory* sense insinuated thereby. Will you then imagine so grossly as if I understood it of this very Flesh I bear about with me, when as this *particular body* of mine after my *Ascension* into Heaven will be removed at a *vast distance* from you? I tell you, *this Flesh of mine*, as to this purpose I have all this time driven at, *profiteth nothing*, you cannot feed of it at such a distance if it were to be fed on.

The Text runs thus, *vers. 63.* τὸ πνεῦμα ἔστι τὸ ζωοποιῶν, *it is that quickening spirit* I aim at in my discourse, that *Divine* or *Spiritual Body* of mine. ἡ σὰρξ ἐν ᾗ φάγεσθαι ἔδεν, *that Flesh*, which you understand and are so scandalized at the eating thereof, *profiteth nothing* as to this purpose, nor has the Blood taken in your sense any thing to do here. *The words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life.* The Object of those words spoken is my *Spiritual Body* and Blood, not as I am a *Man*, but the *Eternal Word*, the *Divine Logos*, which contains in it the *Zw̄n* or *Spirit*, and my *Divine Body universal*, that belongs to that my *Life* or *Spirit*. This is the true Mystery of the Matter, for by these two things asserted by our Saviour,

1. That we are to eat his Flesh and drink his Blood as we hope ever to have Eternal Life.
2. And his declaring his Flesh profiteth nothing, it is manifest that that distinction of *Gratian* is true, which he seems to have taken out of *S. Hierom* or some other ancient Father, who tells us the Flesh and Blood of

Christ is twofold, the one *natural* and which he bore about with him and hung once on the Cross, the other *Spiritual* and *Divine*, which we may really eat and drink, that is, *really receive* and draw in at the Celebrating the Holy *Eucharist* by a sincere, fervid and devotional Faith. And consequently there is a *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ in partaking of the Lord's Supper, whereby our Souls are nourished to Eternal Life.

And in that, he says, his *natural* Flesh profiteth nothing to this purpose (for it cannot be said that it profiteth nothing at all, since in vertue of the *Crucifixion* of that *Flesh*, and *Effusion* of that *Blood* on the Cross, we have the remission of our Sins) Christ plainly infers that he has (which cannot be well understood but as he is the *Eternal Logos*) another *Flesh*, viz. that *Spiritual* and *Divine* *Flesh*, which is mainly profitable for this purpose, for the maintaining, perfecting and renewing the *inward man*, that he may attain to his due growth in Christ.

And lastly, How can Christ say, his Flesh that was Crucified on the Cross *profiteth nothing*, when by being *meditated upon* at the Solemnity of the Holy *Eucharist*, and also at other times, it may serve to kindle and inflame our Love and Devotion towards him, and so urge us to greater degrees of *Repentance* and *Mortification*, and *serious Holiness*; it therefore being useful and profitable for *all this*, I say, why does he then affirm *it profiteth nothing*, but that he does on purpose advertise us that it profiteth nothing *as to the present case* he has spoke to all this while, viz. to be the *real meat* and *food* of the *inward man*, and to be *really received* into him, to maintain and encrease those *Divine Principles* in him out of which he is *regenerated*? This his *particular* *Flesh* and *Bloud*, that hung

hung on the Cross, cannot be profitable for, nor can be come at, at such a distance, to be taken in and received; which therefore plainly implies *those other*, which were mentioned above out of *Gratian* (the *Divine* or *Spiritual* Flesh and Bloud of Christ only) to be properly useful to this purpose.

8. And for ~~this~~ Divine and Spiritual Flesh and Bloud of our Saviour, distinguished from his natural; besides *St. Hierome*, you have also the Suffrage of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, in his *Pedagogus*, lib. 2. cap. 2. Διπλὸν ὃ τὸ αἷμα τῷ κυρίῳ, τὸ μὴ γὰρ ἔστιν αὐτῷ σαρκικὸν ὡς τὸ φθορᾶς λελυρωμένον, τὸ δὲ πνευματικόν, ταῖς ἐκείνῳ κεχρίσμεθα. The Bloud of our Lord is twofold, the one carnal, by which we are redeemed from corruption; the other Spiritual wherewith we are anointed, and by virtue of drinking thereof we attain to incorruption. Καὶ τῶτ' ἐστὶ πέν τὸ αἷμα τῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ μεταλαβεῖν ἀφθαρσίας. And as he makes the Bloud of our Lord twofold, so we may be sure he makes his Body or Flesh, because his Mystical Body and Bloud go together. According to that which *Mr Pelling* in his Pious and Learned Discourse of the Sacrament, quotes out of *S. Ambrose*, who, says he, speaking of that Body which is received in the Eucharist, calls it the Spiritual Body of Christ, the Body of a Divine Spirit; and he does confidently affirm of all the Antients who have either purposely interpreted, or occasionally quoted the Words of Christ, in the sixth of *S. John*, touching the eating his Flesh and drinking his Bloud, that they all understand him to speak of a Spiritual Flesh and Bloud, distinct not only from the Substance of the Holy Elements, but also from that natural Body of Christ which he took of the Substance of the Holy Virgin, pag. 233. So little Novelty is there in this distinction of the

Body and Bloud of Christ into Natural, and Spiritual or Divine.

CHAP. VII.

1. *An Apology for being thus operose and copious in inculcating the present Point from the usefulness thereof.*
2. *The first usefulness in that it defeats Monsieur de Meaux his Stratagem to reduce us to Transubstantiation, as if no Real Presence without it.*
3. *The second usefulness, for the rectifying the Notion of Consubstantiation.*
4. *The third for more fully understanding the Mystery of the Eucharist, with Applications of it to several Passages in our Communion-Service.*
5. *The fourth for a very easie and natural Interpretation of certain Passages in our Church-Catechism.*
6. *The privilege of the faithful Receiver, and of what great moment the Celebration of the Eucharist is.*
7. *The last usefulness in solidly reconciling the Rubrick at the end of the Communion-Service, with that noted Passage in our Church-Catechism.*

1. **T**HE Reader may haply think I have been over operose and copious in inculcating this Distinction of *Gratian's*, touching the Body and Bloud of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. But the great usefulness thereof, I hope, may apologize for this my extraordinary diligence and industry. For the Notion being both true and unexceptionable, and not at all clashing, so far as I can discern, with either the *Holy Scripture*, or *right Reason* and *solid Philosophy*, to say nothing of the Suffrage of the Primitive

tive Fathers, but rather very agreeable and consentaneous to them all; and also having, as I said, its weighty usefulness, it was a Point, I thought, that was worth my so seriously insisting upon; and as I have hitherto endeavoured faithfully to set out the *Truth* thereof, I shall now, though more briefly, intimate its *Usefulness*.

2. And the first Usefulness is this, Whereas that Reverend Prelate the Bishop of *Meaux* tugs so hard to pull back again the Reformed Churches to the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, by this *Concession*, or rather *Profession* of theirs, that there is a *Real Presence* of the Body and Bloud of Christ at the Celebration of the *Eucharist*, to be received by the *faithful*, and that therefore they must return to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as if there were no other Mode of a *Real Presence* to be conceived but it: the force of this Inference is plainly taken away, by this Distinction that *Gratian*, one of their own Church, hath luckily hit upon, or rather taken out of some antient Father, and is more fully made out in this Discourse, that there is a *Spiritual* and *Divine Body* of Christ, distinct from that *particular* Body of his that hung on the Cross, which the faithful partake of in the Lord's Supper. Whence it is plain there is no need of *Transubstantiation*, which is incumbered with such abundance of *Impossibilities* and Contradictions.

3. Secondly, This Notion of ours is hugely serviceable for the rectifying of the Doctrine of *Consubstantiation* in the *Lutheran* Church, who are for an *Ubiquity* of the *particular* Body of Christ that hung on the Cross, which assuredly is a grand Mistake. But I believe in the Authors thereof there was a kind of *Parturiency*, and more confused *Divination* of that
Truth,

Truth, which we have so much insisted upon, and their Mistake consists only in this, that they attributed to the *particular* Body of Christ, which belongs to his *restrained* and circumscribed *humane* Nature, that which truly and only belongs to his *Divine Body*, as he is the *Eternal Logos*, in whom is the *Zōn*, the *Life* or *Spirit* of the *Logos*, to which Spirit of *his* this Body belongs, and therefore is rightly called *his Body*, as appertaining to *his* Spirit. For this Body, this *Divine* and *Spiritual* Flesh, as *Gratian* calls it, is every where present, though not to be received as the Food of the *Inward man*, but only by the *Faithful* and *Regenerate*; so that according to this Notion there may be a *Consubstantiation* rightly interpreted, that is a *Compresentiation*, or rather *Compresentiality* of both the *Real Bread* and *Wine*, and the *Real Body* and *Bloud of Christ* at once; so that they both may be *really* and *indeed* received by all true Believers. And *Lutheranism* in this Point thus candidly interpreted, will prove a sound and unexceptionable *Doctrine*. And I charitably believe, the first Authors of it, if they had fully understood their own meaning, meant no more than so. And I wish I had as much reason to believe that the *Pontificians* meant no more by their *Transubstantiation*, but a *firm* and *fast hold* of the *Real Presence*. I hope the most ingenuous of them at this time of the day mean no more than so, *viz.* That they are as well assured of the *Real Presence* of the Body and Bloud of Christ to be received in the Celebration of the *Eucharist*, as if the very Bread was turned into his Body, and the Wine into his Bloud by a miraculous *Transubstantiation*.

4. Thirdly, It is from this Notion or Distinction of the ancient Fathers, as I hinted above, of the Body and Bloud of Christ into Natural and Spiritual or Divine,

Divine, that we have ever been well appointed to give a more full and distinct account of the nature of the Solemnity of the *Eucharist* as it is celebrated in our Church, it plainly comprizing these two things. The first the *Commemoration* of the *Death of Christ*, of the breaking his Body or Flesh, *viz.* the wounding thereof with Nails and Spears. The other, The partaking of the *Divine Body* and *Blood* of Christ, by which our *Inward Man* is nourished to Eternal Life: which our *eating* the *Bread* and *drinking* the *Wine* are Symbols of. Both which in our *Communion-Service* are plainly pointed at. The first fully, in the Exhortation to Communicants, where it is said, *And above all things you must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the Redemption of the World by the Death and Passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and Man, who did humble himself even to the Death upon the Cross for us miserable sinners* — And to the end we should always remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits, which by his *precious Blood-shedding* he hath obtained to us, he has instituted and ordained Holy Mysteries as pledges of his Love, and for a continual remembrance of his *Death*. And in the Prayer of Consecration, the Celebration of the *Eucharist* is again said to be a *continued* or *perpetuated Commemoration* of Christ's *precious Death* till his coming again.

But now for our receiving the *Spiritual* and *Divine* Body and Blood of Christ, such passages as these seem to intimate it. In the *Exhortation* to the *Communicants*, it is there said, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive this Holy Sacrament, then we *spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood,*

blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we are one with Christ and Christ with us. This passage plainly points to our Saviour's Discourse, *John 6. vers. 56.* where he says, *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.* And he thus dwelling in us, he enlivens us, we becoming one with Christ in a manner as the Soul and Body makes one, as it followeth in the next verse, *As the living father has sent me, and I live by the father, so he that eateth me shall live by me,* and so we become one with Christ and Christ with us, we living by Christ as he by his Father; that is to say, as Christ lives by his Father, so we live by the Spirit of Christ dwelling in us, *Rom. 8. 11.* which Spirit or Life of Christ always implies the Divine Body. As he that is joined unto the Lord in this Body is one Spirit, *1 Cor. 6. 17.* Now this Exhortation so plainly alluding to this passage of our Saviour's Discourse, which speaks not of his particular natural Flesh, but of that which is his Spiritual or Divine Flesh, it is plain that the genuine sense of the Exhortation in this place is, that we really though spiritually (that is by a fervent and devotional Faith) eat or receive the real Body and Blood of Christ, viz. that Divine and Spiritual Body and Blood of his above-mentioned. And this passage of our Saviour's Discourse is again alluded to in the Prayer immediately before the Prayer of Consecration in these words, "Grant us therefore, Gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy Dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his Blood, that our sinful Bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our Souls washed through his most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us, *John 6. 56.* And these two places so plainly alluding to our Saviour's Discourse in the sixth of *St John*, it is very easie and natural

to conceive, that what occurs in the *Thanksgiving* after our receiving the Sacrament, does sound to the same purpose. "Almighty and everlasting God, "we most heartily thank thee for that thou dost "vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these "Holy Mysteries, with the *Spiritual Food* of the "most *Precious Body* and *Blood* of thy Son and our "Saviour Jesus Christ — The words even of themselves do very naturally point at a *real* though *spiritual* partaking or *receiving* into us the Body and Blood of Christ, namely, of that Flesh and Blood which our Saviour discoursed of, *John* 6. And therefore we may be much more assured that they do so, if we take notice, the sense is so back'd and strengthened by the other two Passages which do plainly relate to the Body, or Flesh and Blood Christ discoursed of, in the sixth of *S^t John's* Gospel.

I will only add one Consideration more, and that is from the Title of our *Communion-Service*. Can there be any more likely reason why the Lord's Supper is called **THE HOLY COMMUNION**, than that it refers to that of *S^t Paul*, *1 Cor.* 10. 16. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? Because there is one Bread, we being many are one Body. For we are all partakers of that one Bread.* Which is that Bread from Heaven, which our Saviour discoursed of in the sixth of *S. John*. But the Words I have chiefly my Eye upon are those: The Cup being called *κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος*, the *Communion of the Blood*; and the Bread, *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος*, the *Communion of the Body* of Christ; and the word *κοινωνία*, in all likelyhood, having the same sense that it had, *2 Pet.* 1. 4. in *θείας κοινωνίας*, where we are said to be called to the *Participation*

icipation of the *Divine Nature*, Communion here in *S. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians* must *naturally* imply our *real* receiving or *partaking* of the Body and Blood of Christ in the celebrating of this Holy Communion, and that by thus partaking of that *one Divine Body and Blood* of his, signified by the eating and drinking the Bread and Wine, we, though *many*, become *one Body*: not in a *Political Sense* only, but, if I may so speak, *Divinely natural*, we being made *all Members* of that *one Universal Divine Body* of Christ, as he is the *Eternal Logos*, and so becoming *ἡμεῖς ὅλοι* *2 Pet. i. 4.*

Wherefore, That Passage in *S. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians*, does marvellous-fully set out the Nature of that part of the Lord's Supper, that is distinguished from the *Commemoration* of his *Death*, and gives the most genuine Reason of its being called the *Holy Communion*, it implying the *real Communication* of that *one Divine Body* of Christ to the faithful, and their *real Union* thereby with Christ and with one another, which is a full and perfect Holy Communion indeed.

5. Fourthly, This Notion of the Fathers touching the *Spiritual* or *Divine Body and Bloud* of Christ, affords us a very easie and natural Interpretation of that Passage in our *Church-Catechism*, touching the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, where to the Question, *What is the inward part, or thing signified?* It is answered, "The Body and Bloud of Christ which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. In the Answer to a former Question, *Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?* it is answered, "For a continual Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the *Death* of Christ, and the *Benefits* received thereby. One eminent

minent benefit whereof is the *Remission of our sins* through the *Bloud* of Christ shed on the Cross, for without bloud there is no Remission ; the other is the *feeding* of the *Regenerate Soul*, or *Inward man*, by the *Real*, but *Spiritual* or *Divine Body* and *Bloud* of Christ, which contains in it our thorough *Sanctification*, which is also a fruit or benefit of the Sacrifice of the *Death* of Christ, forasmuch as we had not been capable of Regeneration and of growth and degrees of Sanctification by the feeding on and really receiving the *Spiritual* and *Divine Body* of Christ, without our *Reconciliation* by his *Bloudshed* on the Cross, which our Church here calls the *Sacrifice* of the *Death* of Christ.

Now as in this Answer there is contained that great Benefit of the *Remission of our sins* in the *Bloud* of Christ, and thereby of our *Reconciliation* to God ; so in the Answer *mentioned before* is contained that singular Benefit of *perfecting* our *Sanctification* by the nourishing and corroborating our *inward man* by eating or partaking of the *Spiritual* or *Divine Body* and *Bloud* of our Saviour, which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. [Verily] that is to say, *ἀληθῶς* or *ἀληθινῶς*, *truly*, in counterdistinction to *Typically*, or *Symbolically*, the *Bread* and *Wine* being but *Types* or *Symbols* of this. Touching which in the Answer to the Question, *What are the Benefits whereof we are made Partakers thereby ?* it is said, *The strengthening and refreshing our Souls by the Body and Bloud of Christ, as our Bodies are by the Bread and Wine*, viz. which are but *Types* of the *true*, *Spiritual* or *Divine Body* and *Bloud* of Christ, but they have a very handsome Analogy the one to the other. But we proceed to the following words [And indeed] that is to say, *ὄντως* or *ᾤοντι*, *revera*, or *really*,

not as one scotically would make us to profess, that this *real* participation of the Body and Bloud of Christ, has no *reality* any where but in our *phancy*, which we call *Faith*. To which sense the Translator of the *peaceable method for the re-uniting Protestants and Catholicks*, speaks in his *Preface* to his *Translation*. To which exception, this Notion of the Primitive Fathers, according to which our Communion-Service is framed, and our Homilies allude to, and we so much insist upon, is not liable. [By the Faithful] and that *only* by them, which Body and Bloud the *Faithful* do not receive by champing it with their Teeth, and swallowing it down their Throat; But by a fervid and living devotional *Faith* more than ordinarily kindled at the Celebrating the Holy Eucharist, they draw this *Divine* and *Celestial* Food (the true *Manna* from Heaven) into their Hearts; whereby their *inward man* is fed and strengthened, and nourished up to Eternal Life, and so the *New Birth* getting growth daily, arrives at last to the due measure of the stature of Christ.

6. This is the Priviledge of the *faithful* Receiver. But for those that are devoid of this *true* and living *Faith*, though the *Divine* Body and Bloud of Christ is every where present to the faithful, yet they who are *unregenerate*, and consequently devoid of the *Divine* Life, are capable of no union therewith, nor of any growth or strength therefrom. But it is like the light shining into a *dead* man's eye, of which there is no *vital* effect. But for those who are *regenerate*, and consequently have a *real* hunger and thirst after the *Righteousness* of God, though the great Feast upon this Heavenly Food is more especially and copiously enjoyed in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist, yet they may in some good measure draw it in day by day.

day by Faith and Devotion, as without the *Presence* of the *Bread* and *Wine* we may at any time *devotionally* think of the Sacrifice of the Death of our Saviour. But certainly this solemn Institution of Celebrating his last Supper, being particularly and earnestly injoyn'd us by *Christ*, if we conscientiously observe the same, it will have a more than ordinary efficacy in us for the ends it was appointed.

7. Sixthly and lastly, as those words of the *Catechism* [the Body and Bloud of Christ which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received, &c.] have, considered in themselves, a very easie and natural sense so explained, as we have according to the Analogy of the Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers and our Church's Homilies that allude to them, explained them; so do they not at all clash with those words of the *Rubrick* affixed at the end of the *Communion Service*, where it is affirmed, "That the Sacramental Bread" and Wine remain still in their very *natural* substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that "were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians) and the *natural* Body and Bloud of our Saviour Christ are in *Heaven*, and *not here*, it being against the *truth* of Christ's *Natural* Body to be at "one time in more places than one. There is, I say, in this no contradiction to what occurs in the *Catechism*, which affirms that there is a *Real Presence* of the Body and Bloud of Christ, which are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper, though here a *Real Presence* is denied of the *natural* Body of Christ. But it is to be considered that this Affirmation and Negation is not of the same Body of Christ, and therefore can be no *contradiction*; and further to be observed, how the very *Rubrick* suggests to us this distinction of the *Natural*

tural

tural Body of Christ (which is appropriated to his particular Soul, and which hung on the Cross and was Crucified) and his *Divine* or *Spiritual* Body, the Body of the *Essential* Life or *Spirit* of the Eternal *Logos*, and therefore rightly termed the Body of the *Logos* incarnate, or of Christ.

And therefore when passages of the Ancient Fathers in the Primitive Times, before the degeneracy of the Church came in, may some of them favour a *Real Absence*, other a *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ, according as different places of the Scripture might occur to their minds touching this matter, the controversy might well be composed by distinguishing betwixt the *Natural* Body of Christ and his *Divine* or *Spiritual* Body; According to the former whereof is the *Real Absence*, according to the latter the *Real Presence* of Christ's Body and Blood, to be received by the Faithful in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist.

CHAP. VIII.

1. Monsieur Maimbourg so cunning and cautious as not to attempt to bring the Protestants to Transubstantiation by their common consent in the *Real Presence*, but by a more general *Maxime*, which, he says, we are all agreed in.
2. The aforesaid *Maxime* with the Explanation thereof.
3. Six Supposals surmiz'd for the strengthening this Engine for the pulling the Protestants into the belief of Transubstantiation.
4. A Counter-Engine consisting of sixteen common Notions, in which, not only the Romanists and we, but all mankind are agreed in.
5. An Examination of the strength of Monsieur

Monsieur Maimbourg's Engine, by recurring upon occasion to these Common Notions; The first Prop examined, viz, the Churches Infallibility by assistance of the Spirit, and discovered to be weak from the Dissension of Churches in matters of Faith in his sense.

6. *From the promise of the Spirit being conditional.*

7. *And from the Predictions in the Prophetical Writings, of a general Degeneracy of the Church.*

8. *The Examination of the second Prop, that would have Transubstantiation believed upon the Synodical decision of a fallible Church.*

9. *The Examination of the third Prop, that would have the Synodical decision pass into an Article of Faith.*

10. *The fourth Prop examined by defining truly what Heresy and Schism is.*

11. *The fifth Prop further explained by Monsieur Maimbourg, in two Propositions.*

12. *An Answer to the two Propositions.*

I Have, I hope, by this time sufficiently proposed and confirmed both the Truth and Usefulness of the distinction of the Body and Blood of Christ (which occurs in the Primitive Fathers) into Natural, and Spiritual or Divine. From whence it may plainly appear to any pious and unprejudiced Reader, that the Inference of a *Transubstantiation* of the Bread and Wine into the *Real Body* and Blood of Christ, from a *Real Presence* of them in the Lord's Supper, is very weak and invalid. Which Monsieur Maimbourg (as well as the Bishop of Meaux, formerly Bishop of Condom) though he take special notice of in his *Peaceable Method*, viz. that this *Real Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, is generally acknowledged by the Protestants, Chap. 3. whom he will have to hold, *That the Sacrament is not a Figure or empty Sign without Efficacy*, but they do maintain,

maintain, saith he, that it does communicate unto us in a most *real* and *effectual* Manner, the *Body* of Jesus Christ to be the *Food* of our Souls; And he will have Monsieur *Claud* himself acknowledge, that before this Novelty of *Transubstantiation* was introduced, every one believed that *Jesus Christ* is *present* in the *Sacrament*, that his *Body* and *Blood* are there *truly* received by the faithful; yet he is so wise and cautious as not to trust to the strength of this Engine for the pulling us back into a belief and profession of that incredible Hypothesis, but according to the Fineness of his wit, has spread a more large Net to catch us in and carry us captive, not only into this gross Error of *Transubstantiation*, but into all other Errours which the Church of *Rome* has broached, or may hereafter broach and propose as *Articles of Faith*. And therefore it is a point worth our closest consideration.

2. His general *Maxim* is this, That that Church in which are found two Parties concerned, has ever had the power to determine all differences, and to declare that as *matter of Faith*, which before there was no obligation to believe, and that we are bound to acquiesce in her Decisions, under Penalty of being *Schismatics*.

By the Church her declaring as *matter of Faith* (which seems to sound so harshly) he does not mean, That the Church has Authority to frame *New Articles of Faith*, (*pag. 17.*) but that She is to act according to a *Rule*, which is *Holy Scripture*, and *Tradition* truly and purely *Apostolical*, from which we have also received the Holy Scripture it self. And (*pag. 18.*) The Church never did make, and undoubtedly never will make any *New Articles of Faith*, since it is not in her power to define any thing but according to the *Word of God*, which she is always to consult with, as
with

with her *Oracle*, and the *Rule* she is bound to follow.

His meaning therefore must be this, That besides those plain and Universally known Articles of the Christian Faith, and acknowledged from the very beginning of Christianity, such as are comprised in the Apostles Creed, there have been, and may be other Articles of Faith more obscurely and uncertainly delivered in Scripture, which, until the Church in a lawful Synod or Council has determined the sense of those places of Scripture that appertain to the Controversie, men have no obligation to believe, but go for the present, for but uncertain and indifferent Opinions. But when once the true Church, in which the Parties differing in Opinion are, and her lawful *Representative* assisted by the Holy Ghost, (as is affirmed *Chap. 2. pag. 28.*) a *Canonical Assembly*, which alone has full Power and Sovereign Authority to say juridically (*Chap. 4. pag. 27.*) *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us*, has given definitive Sentence touching the Controversie, that which before was but an *indifferent Opinion*, becomes now *Matter of Faith*, and is to be received as an *Article of Faith* by the Dissenting Party, upon penalty of being *Schismatics* and *Hereticks*. This I conceive to be his precise meaning.

But the great Artifice of all is, that he will have this meaning of his to be the *general* Opinion also of the Protestant Churches. Who can, says he, (*page 27.*) question, but the Protestant Churches of *England, France, Germany, and Switzerland* and the *Low Countries* do hold as a Fundamental *Maxim*, that in such Controversies as do arise concerning Doctrine in Matters of Religion, the true Church of which the Dissenting Parties are Members, has full and sovereign power to declare according to the Word of God, *what is of Faith*, and that there is an Obligation of

standing to her Decrees, under pain of being *Schismatics*? And (page 35.) I demand, saith he, nothing more for the present: I will content my self with what themselves do grant; That that Church of which the Parties contesting are Members, (be she *fallible* or *infallible*) has full power to decide Differences, and her Decrees do oblige under the Penalty of being *Schismatics*.

3. Now from this general *Maxim* granted, as he conceives, on both sides, and which he does chiefly endeavour to prove from the carriage of the Synod of *Dort*, toward the *Arminians* (all which things to repeat here would be too moliminous and inconsistent with the Brevity I intend, a full Answer to Monsieur *Maimbourg's Method* requiring some more able Pen) he declining, I say, all dispute touching the *Merit* of the Cause, the point of *Transubstantiation*, he would hence draw us in, to the imbracing that Doctrine merely because we were once of that Church that has *Synodically* determined for it, and consequently reconcile us to all the rest of the Errors of the Church of *Rome*. But that we may not so easily be taken in this *Net*, or pulled in by this *Engine*, we will first examine the *Supposals* that support the strength of it, or of which it does consist.

The first and chiefest whereof is, That such Synods to whose definitive sentence he would have us stand, are assisted by the Holy Ghost.

The second, That whether they be or be not, we are to stand to their determination.

The third, Whatever Matters of *Opinion* (as they are for the present but such) are decided by such a *Synod*, pass into *Articles of Faith*.

The fourth, That those that will not close with these Decisions, be they what they will, they are guilty

guilty of *Schism*, as being bound to assent.

The fifth, That these decisive Synods or Assemblies, are to decide according to the Rule of the Word of God.

The sixth and last, That both the Protestants and Papists are agreed in all these.

4. Now before I examine these *Particulars*, these *Supposals*, *Parts* or *Props* of his general *Maxim*, by which he would draw the Protestants again into the Church of *Rome*, and make them embrace *Transubstantiation*, and all other Superstitions and Errours which they have *Synodically* decided for matters of Faith: I will, following the very method of this shrewd Writer, propose not only *one* *Maxime*, but *several* *Maximes*, wherein both the *Romanists* and *We*, and indeed all Mankind are agreed, and which therefore I will, instead of *Maximes*, call *Common Notions*, in allusion to those of *Euclid*. And the first shall be this,

I. That which in it self is false, no declaring or saying it is true can make it true.

II. Whatever is plainly repugnant to what is true, is certainly false.

III. Whatever is false, can be no due Article of a true Faith or Religion.

IV. The Senses *rightly circumstantiated* are true Judges of their Object, whether such an Object be Earth, Air, Fire, or Water, Body or Spirit, and the like.

Besides that this is a *Common Notion* with all Mankind, the Incarnate Wisdom himself has given his suffrage for it, in his arguing with *S^t Thomas*, *John* 20. ver. 27. *Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but belie-*

ving. What is this but the appealing to the truth of sense by our Saviour himself? And *Luke 24. ver. 29.* Behold my hands and my feet that it is I my self, handle me and see; for a Spirit has not flesh and bones as ye see I have. Here is an Appeal both to *Sense* and *Reason* at once, and that about the *very Body* of Christ, touching which the great Controversie is raised.

V. An Essence or Being that is *one*, so long as it remains so, as it is *distinct* from others, so it is *undividable* or inseparable from *it self*.

VI. The Whole is bigger than the Part, and the Part less than the Whole.

VII. In every Division, though the Parts agree with the Whole, yet they disagree amongst themselves. So that the Part *A.* is not the very Part *B.* nor the Part *B.* the very Part *C.* nor can each Part be truly and adequately the Whole by the foregoing Common Notion.

VIII. The *same* Body cannot be actually a *Cube* and a *Globe* at once, and there is the same reason of any other different Figures of a Body.

IX. No Revelation, the Revealing whereof, or the manner of the Revealing whereof is *repugnant* to the *Divine Attributes*, can be from God.

X. No *Tradition* of any such Revelation can be true, for as much as the *Revelation* it self is *impossible*.

XI. No Interpretation of any Divine Revelation that is repugnant to rightly circumstantiated Sense and pure and unprejudiced Reason, whether it be from a private or publick hand, can be any Inspiration from God.

XII. No Body can be bigger and less than it self at once.

XIII. That Individual Body that is already, nor ceaseth to be, cannot be made while it is already existing.

XIV. *One*

XIV. *One* and the *same* Body cannot be both *present* with it self and many thousand miles *absent* from it self at once.

XV. *One* and the *same* Body cannot be shut up in a *Box*, and free to walk and run in the *Fields*, and to ascend into the very *Heavens* at the same time.

XVI. And lastly (to omit many other such self-evident Truths. or *Common Notions*) it is impossible, that a man should swallow his whole Body, Head, Feet, Back, Belly, Arms, and Thighs, and Stomach it self, through his Mouth, down his Throat into his Stomach, that is, every whit of himself into one knows not what of himself, less than a Mathematical Point or nothing. For if all be swallowed, what is there left of the man for it to be swallowed into, but a mere *Point*, or rather *nothing*?

5. Certainly all the World, as well *Papists* as *Protestants*, as soon as they do but conceive the meaning of the Terms, will assent to the Truth of these Propositions at the very first sight; which therefore has made me call them *Common Notions*. Let us now apply our selves to the use of them in the examining the strength of Mr *Maimbourg's* general *Maxime*, wherein he will have the *Papists* and *Protestants* agreed:

The first Prop thereof is, That the *true Church* is *infallible* by the promise made to her of being *assisted by the Holy Ghost*. But here I demand whether this Promise be made to the *Universal Church*, or any *Particular Church* or Churches throughout all Ages. That it is not made to the *Universal Church throughout all Ages*, is plain, in that the Parts thereof have been and are still divided in several *matters of Faith*. That no such Promise is made to any *Particular Church* or Churches, is plain from hence, that *these Churches are not named* in any part of the Scripture; which

which omission is incredible, if there had been any such entailment of *Infallibility* upon any *Particular* Church or Churches. But of all Churches, I humbly conceive, it is *impossible* it should be the Church of *Rome*, unless it be possible that all those *Common Notions* which I have set down, and in which all the World, even the Church of *Rome* her self, if they will speak their consciences, are agreed, be false, which they must be if *Transubstantiation* be true. And therefore let any man judge whether is the more likely, *viz.* That *Transubstantiation* should be false, or those *Common Notions* not true.

6. Again, How does it appear that this Promise of the assistance of the Holy Ghost is not *conditional*? Indeed Christ says, *John* 16. 13. *When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, viz.* the same Spirit that is promised, *Chap.* 14. *ver.* 15, 16, 17. But the words of this pretended *Charter of Infallibility* are there set down more fully: *If ye love me, keep my commandments; And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth whom the World cannot receive.* — The Promise of the assistance of the Holy Ghost for the infallibly concluding what is true, even from the words of this pretended *Charter of Infallibility*, is *conditional*; that is to say, if they so love Christ as to keep his commandments, and become not worldly and carnal, (for the World cannot receive this Spirit of truth) then this Spirit which leadeth into all truth shall assist them. Wherefore as many as Christ sends this *infallible* Spirit to, he first fits them for it by mortifying the Spirit of the World in them, and making them *Members* of his truly Holy Church; for the calling themselves *Holy Church*, makes them never a jot the more Holy, if they really be not so, by the first Common Notion. And

And besides, If the Words of this *Charter of Infal-*
libility had not been so express, yet in common sense
and reason this condition would necessarily have been
understood. Forasmuch as nothing can be more ab-
surd than to imagine the *Assistance* of the *Holy Ghost*
to be so *cheap* and *trivial* a thing, as to be procured
for the concluding Controversies arising or set on foot
in the Church, which are needless and frivolous, or
more for satisfying *Curiosity* than *Edification*, and
which tend to *Division*, and tearing the Church vio-
lently into parts, which was *one* before and in a *sal-*
vable condition without this Decision, as Monsieur
Maimbourg confesses himself: Or that the Holy Ghost
will *assist* such *Assemblies* as are *worldly* and *carnally*
minded, and are called to conclude for the *worldly* Ad-
vantage and Interest of a worldly Polity, who for the
upholding and increasing their *Temporal* Empire
(whereby they Lord it over the World, and ride on
the necks of Kings and Princes) call themselves *Spiri-*
tual. Certainly when all Christian Truth tends to
real and indispensable Holiness, if mankind were not
left to the liberty of their own Will, but Christ
would have them so *infallibly* wise, he would all along
have prepared them for it, by making them unexcep-
tionably Holy, that they might become wise in his
own Way and Method.

7. And lastly, There being *Predictions* in *Daniel* and
the *Apocalypse* of an *Antichristian* State in the Church
to come (in which there will be such a general Apo-
stasie from the Apostolick Purity) even according to
their own Interpreters, I demand what assurance we
have that these Times came not (in a very great mea-
sure) upon the Church, some hundreds of Years be-
fore *Transubstantiation* was concluded on by the Ro-
man Church, which therefore must much invalidate
the

the pretence of the *Infallibility* of any such Councils. And our Church of *England*, as all know, in her *Homilies*, whether by *inspiration* or by *mere solid Reason* and Judgment, refers the vision of the seventeenth Chapter of the *Apocalypse*, to the Church of *Rome*. And, I hope, to any unprejudiced Reader, that has leisure to examine things, I have even demonstratively made out that truth in my *Exposition* of the *Apocalypse*, and most punctually and distinctly of all in my *Joint-Exposition* of the thirteenth and seventeenth Chapters thereof, *Synops. Prophet.* Book 1. Chap. 11, 12, 13, &c. with the *preparatory* Chapters thereto. Let any one read them that please, and in the due fear of God consider them.

Wherefore, to conclude, touching this first Prop of his general *Maxim*, whereby he would insinuate that *Synods*, to whose definitive Sentence he would have us to stand, are *assisted* by the *Holy Ghost*, it does not only not underprop, but undermine his grand *Maxim*. Forasmuch as we have no assurance that those *Roman* Councils which have concluded for *Transubstantiation* were assisted by the *Holy Ghost*, but rather quite contrary.

8. The second *Prop* is, That whether a *Synod* be or be not assisted by the *Holy Ghost*, we are to stand to their determination. If the *Synod* be not assisted by the *Holy Ghost* then they are *fallible*, and may be in the wrong: so that the sense is, whether the *Synod* determine *right* or *wrong*, yet we are to stand to their determination. Which as odly as it sounds, yet in some sober sense, I must confess ingenuously, for ought I know, may be true, that is, in such things as are *really disputable*, and which for no sinister base design, but merely for the peace of the Church and Her Edification, it has been thought fit to make a *Synodical* Decision

Decision of the Controversie. But is this colour enough for the Church of *Rome's* Determination to be stood to? Of making the Bread in the Sacrament to be *transubstantiated* into the very Body of Christ that hung on the Cross at *Jerusalem* (and has ever since his Ascension been in Heaven) by the Priest's saying over it, *This is my Body*, the Bread still remaining Bread to all outward appearance, as before, so that Christ is fain to be at the expence of a perpetual Miracle to make the *transubstantiated* Bread look like Bread still, though it be really the Body of Christ that hung on the Cross at *Jerusalem*. Which, as I have noted above, is against his Wisdom and Goodness, in that, if *Transubstantiation* be a true Article of the Christian Faith, this is the most effectual way imaginable to make men, if left to their own free thought, to *mis-believe it*, however force and cruelty might constrain them to *profess* it: And so it is against his Goodness, to expose so great a part of his Church to such bloody Persecutions as this Article has occasioned in the Christian World. That Christ should do a perpetual Miracle not that will confirm mens Faith, but subvert it, not to edifie his Church but distract it, and lay all in confusion and blood! Let any one consider how likely this is to be.

This therefore could never be a point, *bonâ fide*, disputable, but to such as were horribly hoodwinkt with prejudice, and blinded with a desire of having a thing concluded by the Church which was of such unspeakable advantage, as they then thought, for the *magnifying* the *Priesthood*, though I believe nothing will turn more to their Disrepute and shame in the conclusion. Now I dare appeal to Monsieur *Maimbourg* himself, whether we are to stand to the Determination of a *fallible Synod* in a *Point*, that, besides what I

have already hinted, *contradicts* all those *Common Notions*, which I have above recited, and in which all Mankind are agreed. And such is this Point of *Transubstantiation*.

9. Now for the third *Prop*, That whatever Matters of *Opinion* (as they are for the present but such) are decided by such a Synod, pass into *Articles of Faith*; this *Prop* is also really a Puller down of this general *Maxim*. For by an *Article of Faith*, must be meant such an Article, as after the *Synodical Decision*, is necessary to be believed by all Parties upon pain of Damnation. But to this I answer, first, No *Falshood* can be an *Article of Faith*, nor can what is in it self false, by all the declaring in the World that it is true, become true, by the first *Common Notion*. And secondly, Since the whole Church before, in which arose the Controversie, were in a *salvable Condition*, how Unchristian an act must this be, to put so many thousand Souls in the State of Damnation, by so *unnecessary*, nay *mischievous* a *Synodical Decision*! And therefore what pretence can there be to the *Assistance* of the *Holy Ghost*, which Christ has promised his Church, when they machinate that, which so manifestly tends, according as the *Synod* acknowledges, to the Damnation of such a multitude of Souls, which before the Decision were in a *salvable Condition*, and also to most *barbarous Persecutions* of their *Persons*, as it is notoriously known in History, touching *Transubstantiation*?

10. The fourth *Prop* charges those with the guilt of *Schism* and *Heresie* that will not close with the above-said *Synodical Decisions*, be they what they will. In which matter we cannot judge whether the charge be right, unless we first understand what is truly and properly *Heresie* and *Schism*. The former whereof I demand

demand what it can be, but a dissent from the *Catholic Church* even in those things in it, that are *Apostolical*. For whatever *National Church* is found to have *all* and *nothing* else in it but what is *Apostolical*, or not *inconsistent* with the Apostolical Doctrine and Practice, is most assuredly one part of that *one Catholic and Apostolick Church*, which we profess our Belief of in our *Creed*. And for the latter it can be nothing else but a separation from the *Catholic Church*, or from any Church that is part thereof, even then, when she approves her self to be *Catholic*, that is to say even then, when she is *Apostolick*, or, though she be *Apostolick*, and offers no opinions or usages but such as are conformable to the usages and Doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, or have no repugnancy thereto. To separate from the Church in such circumstances as these, certainly is that great Crime of *Schism*; but to separate from that part of the Church which imposes opinions and practices plainly *repugnant* to the Precepts of Christ and his Apostles, this is no *Schism* but *Union* with the *truly ancient Catholic and Apostolick Church*. And the declaring it *Schism* does not, nor can make it so, by *Common Notion* the first. And if it were *Schism* to separate from such a Church as propounds things repugnant to the Precepts of Christ and his Apostles, the guilt of this *Schism* is not upon them that thus separate, but upon those that impose such *Anti-Apostolical* matters.

11. The fifth *Prop*, That these *decisive Synods or Assemblies* are to *decide* according to the *Rule of the Word of God*; the strength of this *Prop* he endeavours more fully to display *pag. 34.* and he calls upon the Brethren of the Reformed Churches to reflect seriously upon these two Propositions he sets down.

The first is, That as the Word of God is *infallible* in it self, so certainly the judgment of him who truly judges according to this *Rule* is also *infallible*: And consequently they are obliged to believe, That the Church when she judges according to *this Rule* or the Word of God, does not only not err, but that she also cannot err.

The second, That they [the Reformed] are bound [as well as we the Romanists] to believe that the Church of God deciding *Controversies* of Faith, does judge according to the *true* sense of the word of God: Because upon the matter it is concerning this *very* sense that she gives judgment betwixt the Parties, who give it a *different* sense, and who are obliged in Conscience to submit to her judgment, under pain of being *Schismatics* and *Hereticks*, as their Synod of Dort has positively declared.

12. The first of these Propositions may pass for firm and sound, provided that the meaning of *her judging according to this rule* is the *giving the right and genuine sense thereof*: Of which she can neither assure her self nor any one else, but by being assured of that *Holiness, Integrity, and singleness* of Heart, in those of the *Synod*, that makes them capable of the *Assistance* of the *Holy Ghost*; and also that their *Decision* clashes not with those *indeleble* Notions in the *Humane Soul*, that are *previous Requisites* for the understanding the meaning of *not only* the *Holy Scriptures*, but of any *Writing* whatever. And unto which if they find any thing in the *Letter* of the *Sacred Writ* repugnant, they may be sure it is a *Symbolical* or *Figurative* Speech, but in *other Writings*, that it is either a *Figurative* Speech or *Nonsense*. He that has not this *previous* Furniture, or makes *no use* of it, it is impossible he should prove a safe Judge of the sense of *Scripture*.

pture. And if he runs *counter* to what is *certainly true*, it is evident his Interpretation is *false* by the second *Common Notion*, and that he is not inspired by *Common Notion* the eleventh.

Touching the second Proposition, I demand how any can be bound to stand to the judgment of any *Synod*, if they decline the *previous Requisites*, without which it is *impossible* to understand the right meaning of any *Writing whatsoever*; and whether their pretending to judge *according to a Rule*, does not imply, that there are some *Common Principles*, in which *all Parties* are agreed, according to which, though they cannot discern that the *Synod* has certainly defined right, yet if the *Synod* run *counter* to them, they may be sure they have defined wrong, touching the *very sense* controverted between the *Parties*. Their professing they judge according to the *Rule*, implies the *Rule* is in some measure known to all that are concerned. Nor does it at all follow, because the *Object* of their *decision* is the *very sense* controverted between the *Parties*, that the *Synod* may give what judgment she will, break all *Laws of Grammar and Syntax* in the expounding the *Text*; much less contradict those *Rules* which are *infinitely more Sacred*, and inviolable, the *Common Notions* which God has imprinted *essentially* on the *Humane Understanding*. If such a violence be used by any *Interpreters of Scripture*, neither the *Synod of Dort*, nor any *Reformed Church*, has or will declare, That under pain of being *Schismatics* and *Hereticks*, they are obliged in *Conscience* to submit to their determination.

CHAP. IX.

1. *The examination of the sixth Prop, by demanding whether the Maxim Monsieur Maimbourg proposes is to be understood in the full sense, without any Appeal to any common agreed on Principles of Grammar, Rhetorick, Logick and Morality.*
2. *Instances of enormous Results from thence, with a demand whether the Protestant Churches would allow of such absurd Synodical Decisions.*
3. *That the Citations of History, touching the Synod of Dort, prove not, that all Synodical Decisions pass into proper Articles of Faith, with the Author's free judgment touching the Carriage of that Synod, and of the Parties condemned thereby.*
4. *His judgment countenanced from what is observed by Historians to be the sentiments of King James in the Conference at Hampton Court.*

1. **A**ND yet the sixth and last Prop of the general *Maxime* implies as much, which affirms, That both the *Protestants* and *Papists* are agreed in all the five foregoing *Supposals*, or to speak more compendiously, in that his general *Maxime*, That that Church in which are found the two Parties concerned, has ever had the power to determine all differences, and to declare that as *matter of Faith*, which before there was *no obligation to believe*, and that we are bound to acquiesce in their decisions under the penalty of being *Schismatics*.

But I demand here of Monsieur Maimbourg, whether he will have his *Maxime* understood in a full latitude of sense, and that *immediately* without recourse to any *Principles* in which the *Synod* and the *Parties* are

are agreed, and Counter to which if any determination be made, it is null, such as *Grammatical Syntax* and *Lexicographical* sense of Words, and (which are Laws infinitely more sacred and inviolable) the *Common Notions* (as I said before) essentially imprinted on the Soul of man, either of *Truth* or *Morality*, whether without being bounded by these, the *Protestant Churches* as well as the *Pontifician* are agreed, that we are to stand to the Determination of a *Synod*, under the penalty of being *Schismatics*?

2. As for example, If a *Synod* should interpret, *Drink ye all of this*, of the Clergy only, and declare it does not reach the *Laity*, though the Apostles and Primitive Church understood it did: If notwithstanding *St Paul's* long Exhortation against *Religious Exercise* in an unknown Tongue, 1 *Cor.* 14. they should by some distinction or evasion conclude it lawful. If when as it is said, Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image to worship and fall down before it, they should distinguish and restrain it only to the graven Images of the *Heathen Gods*. If when as it is said, Thou shalt have no other Gods but me, they should distinguish Gods into *Supream* and *Subordinate*, and declare, we may have many *Subordinate* Gods, but only *One Supream*. If when as it is said, Honour thy Father and thy Mother, they should restrain it to a *Father* or *Mother* of the *same Religion* with our selves, whether *Political* Father or *Natural*, otherwise we are free from this Command, and may despise both our *Natural* Parents and our *Prince*, if they be not of the same persuasion with our selves. And whereas it is said, Thou shalt not commit Adultery, if they should understand it only of such an Adultery as is committed for the mere pleasure of the Flesh, not for the health of the Body, or assisting the *Conjugal Impotency* of his Neighbour.

Neighbour. If the Commandment against Murther, or Killing an Innocent Person, they should restrain to Murther that is accompanied with delight in *Cruelty*, not that which is committed to raise a *livelyhood*, or secure an *Interest* the Murtherer has espoused. If the Commandment against *Stealing*, they should restrain to such Theft as is against Men of our Religion and Perswasion, but that we may rob and steal from others without sin. And according to the same tenour they should interpret, Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy Neighbour, &c. I demand, I say, whether Monsieur *Maimbourg* does conceive, that the *Protestants*, nay, or his own Party, are agreed that all such determinations are to be submitted to upon penalty of being *Schismatics*. Let him ask the *Reformed Churches* if they be thus agreed, or rather let him ask his own Conscience, if he think they are. Wherefore it is plain, that what he produces out of the History of the Synod of *Dort*, reaches not the point that he drives at, that is to say, That it is acknowledged by them, that after a Synod has decided the Controversie, or given the sense of places of Scripture controverted, be it what it will be, the Decision is to be stood to, under penalty of being *Schismatics* and that there are not some commonly known Truths, common Notions of Reason and Morality, with which if the determination of a Synod does clash, it is *ipso facto* null, and a demonstration that the Spirit of God did not assist.

3. I observe farther, That all the Citations that are produced either by Monsieur *Maimbourg* himself, or his *Translator*, in his *Preface* and *Appendix*, will not amount to the Protestants professing that every Controversie or controverted Opinion, after the *Decision* of the Synod, passes into an *Article of Faith*, which properly

perly signifies such a Doctrine, as without the Belief of which, when it is proposed, he that mis-believes it forfeits his Salvation ; for hereby the Synod of *Dort* had damned all the *Lutheran Churches*. For my own part I must confess, that in points that are so obscure, intricate and abstruse, and which, as touching the main part of them, have exercised and much baffled humane understanding through all Ages, it had been a great piece of Christian Prudence for that *Synod* to have made Decrees against all bitterness of speech of the disagreeing Parties one against another, and to have admonished them that they were bound, notwithstanding their difference of Opinion, to live in mutual Love one to another, which is the true Badge of Christ's genuine Disciples, rather than to have exasperated one Party against another, by making that Doctrine *Authentick*, which is really in it self from places of *Scripture*, and *Reason* so intricate and disputable. But it seems to have been the sleight of Satan for the weakning the Reformed Churches that drove them to it. But I must say, on the other side, that when the Synod had determined, they who were determined against, ought to have submitted to her determination in a thing so really disputable, and by this Christian Policy to have conserved the peace of the Church, and out-witted the Devil. For if they had had any modesty in them, they might very well in such abstruse, dark and disputable points have compromised with the *Synod*, and preferred the peace and safety of the *Reformed Churches*, before the satisfaction of their own *Opinionativeness*.

4. And that wise Prince, *King James* the first of Blessed Memory, seems to come near to what I have said, in the words delivered by his Embassadour at the Synod of *Dort*, as they are cited by Monsieur *Maim-*

bury himself in his *Peaceable Method*, pag. 23. That for the allaying those troubles, *There was but that one only means which the Church had ever made use of*, a National Synod, which was to be judge in the case, and to decide which of the two Opinions was more conformable to the Word of God : or at least how and in what manner the one or the other might be tolerated in the Church of God. Which latter part is cunningly left out by the *Translator*, in his *Preface*, pag. 3. But in those latter words, King *James* plainly intimates his moderate Sentiments touching the Controversy, and that he would not have the Decision made too rigidly and pinchingly on either side. And suitably to this excellent judgment of his, in the Conference at *Hampton-Court*, when the *Puritans* would have had the nine *Lambeth Articles*, which are more full and express against the points of *Arminianism*, to be embodied into the Articles of our Church, concluded on in the Convocation holden at *London*, in the Year 1562. the King earnestly refused it. And in his Instructions to his *Divines* he sent over to the Synod of *Dort*, this remarkable one was amongst the rest. That they would advise the Churches that the Ministers do not deliver in Pulpit to the People those things for ordinary Doctrines, which are the highest points of the Schools, and not fit for vulgar Capacities, but *disputable* on both sides. And we may be sure when he was so careful in this for the foreign Churches he would not neglect to infuse the same good Principles into his own : And that he could not easily believe that upon the Decision of the Synod of *Dort*, that passed into an *Article of Faith*, without which there is no Salvation, which yet he would have hid from the knowledge of the People.

CHAP. X.

1. *What Synodical Decisions are capable of passing into proper Articles of Faith, and what not.* 2. *The necessity of distinguishing the doctrinal Decisions of Synods into Articles of Faith, properly so called, and Articles of Communion.* 3. *The meaning of the King's Answer to Mr. Knewstubs, in the Conference at Hampton-Court: And that Synods have unlimited Power to put what sense they please on places of Scripture, and make them pass into Articles of Faith, not proved to be the Opinion of the Protestant Churches.* 4. *That our English Church is against it, largely proved out of her Articles.* 5. *No Article of Faith pre-existent in Scripture that cannot be fetched thence but by interpreting against the Proleptick Principles of rightly circumstantiated Sense and Common Notions ingrafted essentially in the Humane Understanding.* 6. *Of Decision of Points necessary to Salvation, and to the justifying the Christian Worship, and those that are less necessary, and less clear, and lastly, those that have an Insuperable Difficulty on both sides.* 7. *Monsieur Maimbourg's general Maxime, that it is not agreed in by the Protestant Churches, abundantly demonstrated, with a Note of the Subtilty of the Romanists in declining the Dispute of the particular merits of their Cause, and making it their business to persuade; first, that their Church is Infallible.* 8. *A Meeting with Monsieur Maimbourg once more in his own Method, and thereby demonstrating that Transubstantiation is grossly false, and consequently the Church of Rome fallible, with an hint of a true peaceable Method of reconciling Papists and Protestants.*

1. **W**herefore it seems needful to take notice of this distinction of the *Doctrinal* Decisions of *Synods*, that some pass into, or rather are of the nature of the *Articles of Faith*, the knowledge of them being *necessary* to keep us from Sin and Damnation. And such were the *Doctrinal* Decisions of those ancient *Primitive* Councils, who out of Scripture plainly declared the truth of the *Divinity* of Christ and *Triunity* of the *Godhead*, without which the Church would be involved in *gross Idolatry*. And therefore the *Decisions* of the Controversies did naturally pass into *professed Articles* of the *Christian Faith*, and such as our Salvation depended on. But to imagine that every *Doctrinal* Decision of a *Synod* passes into a *proper Article of Faith*, without which there is no Salvation, and that a *Synod* has power to make that an *Article of Faith*, before which men were safe and sinless as to that point, is to put it into the power of a *Synod* to damn God knows how many Myriads of men which Christ dyed for, and had it not been for these curious, or rather mischievous Decisions, might have been saved; than which what can be more prodigious?

2. Whence we see plainly, it is *most necessary* to make this distinction in *Doctrinal* Decisions of *Synods*, that some may be *Articles of Faith*, others only *Articles of Communion*, that if any oppose or disparage the said *Articles*, whether they be of the Clergy or Laity, they make themselves obnoxious to *Excommunication*; and if a Clergy-man does not subscribe to them, he makes himself incapable of *Ecclesiastical* Employment. This is all that Monsieur Maimbourg can squeeze out of all his Citations out of the story of the *Synod of Dort*, so far as I can perceive, or his *Translator*

flator in his *Preface* and *Appendix*, out of those he produces touching the Church of *England*.

3. And that which his *Translator* in his *Preface* would make such a great business of, *viz.* 'This wise King's answer to M^r *Knewstubs*, at the Conference at *Hampton Court*, when he was asked, *How far an Ordinance of the Church was to bind men without impeachment of their Christian Liberty*: to which he said, he would not argue that point with him, but answer therein as Kings are wont to speak in Parliament, *Le Roy s'avisera*. And therefore I charge you never speak more to that point how far you are bound to obey when the Church has once ordained it. I say, nothing more can be collected out of this answer, but that he modestly intimated his Opinion, that he meant not that *all Synodical Decisions* passed into *Articles of Faith*, but may be only *Articles of Communion* in the sense I have already explained. And what I have already said, if seriously and considerately applied to what he produces in his *Appendix*, will easily discover that they prove nothing more touching the Church of *England*, than what we have already allowed to be her Doctrine touching the Authority of Synods.

But that a *Synod* without any limitation or appeal to certain *Principles* in which both the *Synod* and *Parties* contesting are all agreed, may by her bare *immediate* Authority, give what sense she pleases on places of Scripture, alledged in the Controversy, and that her *Decision* passes into an *Article of Faith*, which the Parties cast are bound to assent to, under the pain of becoming *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*: Nothing can be more contrary than this to the Declarations of the Church of *England*. So far is it from truth, That *all the Protestant Churches* are agreed in his grand *Maxime* above mentioned.

4. Let

4. Let the Church of *England* speak for her self, *Artic. 19.* "As the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, "and *Antioch*, so also the Church of *Rome* has erred, "not only in their *Living* and Ceremonies, but also "in *Matters of Faith*. And *Article 21.* General "Councils may not be gathered together without the "Commandment and Will of Princes. And when "they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be "an Assembly of men, whereof all be not governed "with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, "and sometimes have erred even in things appertaining to God: wherefore things ordained by them, as "necessary to *Salvation*, have neither Strength nor "Authority, unless it may be declared that they be "taken out of the Holy Scriptures. Here our Church plainly declares, That forasmuch as a Council or Synod consists of *fallible* Persons, they can determine nothing *necessary to Salvation*, but what they can make out that it is clearly, to any unprejudiced Eye, contained in the Scripture, not fetched out by weak and *precarious* Consequences, or *phanciful* Surmises, much less by a *distorted* Interpretation, and *repugnant* to *Common Sense* and *Reason*, which are necessarily supposed in the understanding of any Scripture or Writing whatsoever, as I have intimated above.

And even that Article (20.) which the *Translator* produces in his *Preface*, in the behalf of Monsieur *Maimbourg's* grand *Maxime*, do but produce the whole Article and it is plainly against it. For the words are these: "The Church has power to decree Rites and Ceremonies and Authority in Controversies of Faith; and yet it is not lawful for the "Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to "God's Word written, neither may it so expound "one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.

“nother. Wherefore although the Church be a
“Witness and Keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought
“not to decree any thing *against* the same; so *beside*
“the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be be-
“lieved for *Necessity of Salvation*. It is true, the
Church is here said to have Authority in *Controversies*
of Faith. As certainly if any should raise new Stirrs
in any National Church, touching such points as the
Antient Primitive Synods have concluded for, in the
behalf of the *Divinity of Christ*, and *Triunity* of the
God-head, pretending they have clearer demonstra-
tions than ever yet were proposed against those Deci-
sions or any of like nature, which may concern the
Justifiableness of our *Christian Worship*, and *indispen-
sable way of Salvation*, the Church has Authority as
she ever had, in such Controversies, to ratifie such
Articles of Faith, but she is not said to have Authori-
ty to make every *Synodical Decision* an *Article of Faith*,
whether the nature thereof will bear it or no. Nay
her Authority is excluded from enforcing any thing
besides what is clearly enough contained in the
Scripture (as assuredly those points are above-men-
tioned, though with weak or cavilling men they have
been made questionable) to be believed for *Necessity*
of Salvation. Which is the proper Character of an
Article of Faith, according as the *Preface* to the *Atha-
nasian Creed* intimates. And Monsieur Maimbourg
himself is so sensible of this main Truth, that in the
Explication of his general *Maxime*, he acknowledges
that the Church has no Authority to coin any *New Ar-
ticles of Faith*, but only to declare she has discov-
ered them *existent before* in the Scriptures, but not so
clearly espy’d or discerned as by an assembled Synod..

§. But certainly no *Article of Faith*, that is to say,
no Truth necessary to Salvation can be said to be *pre-
existent*

existent in the Scriptures, and having lain hid to be discovered afterwards, that is not discovered but by such forced Interpretations of the Text, that are repugnant to *Common Sense* and *Reason*. Is not this a Reproach to the Wisdom of God, that he should inspire the Holy Penmen to set down Truth *necessary to Salvation* so obscurely, that the meaning cannot be reached without doing violence to *Common Sense* and *Reason*, and running counter to those *previous Principles*, without which it is impossible to make sense of any writing whatever? Or without interpreting one place of Scripture *repugnantly* to the plain sense of another. Which this Article expressly forbids as unlawful. So plain is it that our Church limits the Authority of a Synod to certain Rules agreed of on all hands, against which they have no Authority to define any thing: And *plain places* of Scripture is one Rule, contrary to which it is not lawful to interpret any either *pretendedly* or *really* obscure place. Nor can any place at all be plain without the admittance of those *Proleptick Principles* of *rightly circumstantiated sense* and *common* undeniable *Notions essentially* ingrafted in the mind of man, whether they relate to *Reason* or *Morality*. These, both *Synod* and *Contesters* are supposed to be agreed on, and therefore no *Synodical Decision* repugnant to these according to our Church in interpreting of Scripture (if I rightly understand her) ought to have Authority with it.

6. But as for *doctrinal* Decisions, such as concern the *Justifiableness* of the Christian Worship, and are of *Necessity to Salvation*, and such as, although either weak or willful cavilling men may make questionable, yet are clearly enough delivered in Scripture, these, questionless, a Synod has Authority to determine as *Articles of Faith*. And such as have not the like
Clearness

Clearness nor *Necessity*, as also innocent and indifferent Rites and Ceremonies, when the one and the other seem *advantagious* to the Church, such *Synodical* Decisions may pass into *Articles of Communion*, in that sense I have above explained. And lastly, as in that case of the Synod of *Dort*, when the points controverted have on both sides that *invincible* Obscurity and Intricacy, and there seems to be *forcible* Arguments for either conclusion; What I humbly conceive is to be done in that case, I have fully enough expressed already, and therefore think it needless again to repeat.

7. In the mean time, I hope, I have made it manifestly apparent that Monsieur *Maimbourg's* general *Maxime*, viz. That the Church, in which are found the two Parties concerned, has ever had the Power to determine all differences, and to declare that as *Matter of Faith*, which before there was no Obligation to believe; And that we are bound to acquiesce in her Decisions under the penalty of being *Schismatics*, is not, (especially as he would have his *Maxime* understood) agreed on by all Churches, as well *Protestant* as *Pontificalian*. And that therefore this *Snare* or *Net*, wherewith he would catch and carry Captive the Protestants into a Profession of the Infallibility of the Church in *Synodical* Decisions, so that the Church must be first allow'd *Infallible*, that we may glibly swallow down whatsoever she decides, even *Transubstantiation* it self, with all other Errours of the Church of *Rome*; this *Net* or *Snare*, I hope, I have sufficiently broken. And I will only note by the bye, how the subtlest *Romanists* declining the *Merits* of the *Cause*, labour Tooth and Nail to establish the *absolute Infallibility* of their Church. But our Saviour tells us, *By the fruit you shall know them.*

M

Wherefore

Wherefore any man or Company of men that profess themselves *infallible*, their *Infallibility* must be examined by their *Doctrines*, which if they be plainly any one of them *false*, their boast of *Infallibility* most certainly is not true.

8. But forasmuch as an *Appeal* to a *Maxime* pretended to be agreed upon by both sides, both *Papists* and *Protestants*, is made use of with so much Wit and Artifice, to ingage the *Protestants* to imbrace *Transubstantiation* and the rest of the *Romish* Errours: I hope Monsieur *Maimbourg* will not take it amiss, if I civilly meet him again in his own Way, and show him by an *Appeal*, not only to *one* *Maxime*, but above a *dozen* at least of *Common Notions*, which I did above recite, and in which both *Papists* and *Protestants*, and all mankind are agreed, that it may demonstratively be made evident that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is grossly false.

For that which in it self is false, no declaring or saying it is true, though by the vote of an *entire Synod*, can make it true, by the *first* of the *Common Notions* above mentioned, *Chap. 8. Sect. 4.*

Secondly, Whatever is plainly repugnant to what is true, is certainly false, and consequently can be no due Article of a true Faith or Religion, by the *second* and *third* *Common Notions*. And therefore *Transubstantiation* cannot pass into an Article of Faith by the Authority of any *Synod* whatever.

Thirdly, Now that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is false, is manifest from the assurance of our Senses rightly circumstantiated. To which our Saviour Christ appeals, who is wiser than all the Synods that ever were or will be, as was observed in *Common Notion the fourth*. But our Senses assure us it is Bread still, not the Body of Christ.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, If *Transubstantiation* be true, an Essence or Being that is *one* remaining *still one*, may be *divided* or separated from *it self*, which is repugnant to the *fifth* Common Notion.

Fifthly, If *Transubstantiation* be true, the *whole* is not bigger than the *part*, nor the *part* less than the *whole*, which contradicts the *sixth* Common Notion.

Sixthly, If *Transubstantiation* be true, the parts in a Division do not only agree with the whole, but agree one with another, and are indeed absolutely the same; for divide a consecrated Wafer into two, *viz. A. and B.* this *A. and B.* are the *same* intire *Individual* Body of Christ according to this Doctrine, which contradicts the *seventh* Common Notion.

Seventhly, If the said Doctrine be true, one and the same Body may be a *Cube* and a *Globe* at once, have the figure of an *Humane Body* and of a *Pyramid* and *Cylinder* at the same time, according as they shall mould the Consecrated Bread, which is repugnant to the *eighth* Common Notion.

Eighthly, *Transubstantiation*, if it be any truth at all, it is a *Revealed Truth*; but no Revelation the *Revealing* whereof, or the *manner* of *Revealing* is *repugnant* to the *Divine Attributes*, can be from God, by Common Notion the *ninth*: but if this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* were a Truth, it seems not to sute with the Wisdom of God to reveal a Truth that seems so palpably to overthrow and thwart *all* the *innate Principles* of humane *Understanding*, and the assurance of the *rightly circumstantiated* Senses, to both which Christ himself appeals, and without which we have no certainty of the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles. And he hence exposes his Church to be befooled by all the luciferous fictions of a fallacious Priesthood.

And besides this, the circumstances or *manner* of its first *Revelation* at the Lord's Supper as they would have it, shows it cannot be; for the Consecrated Bread retaining still the shape and all other sensible qualities of Bread without any change, and that by a *miraculous* supporting them, now *not inherent* in their proper subject *Bread*, which is transubstantiated into that very Body that holds it in his hands, or seems so to do: I say, as I have also intimated before, to be thus at the expence of so *vast* a *Miracle* here at his last Supper, and to repeat the same *Miracle* upon all the Consecrations of the Bread by the Priest, which is the most effectual means to make all men Infidels, as to the belief of *Transubstantiation*, and to occasion thence such *cruel* and *bloody Persecutions*, is apparently contrary to the *Divine Wisdom* and *Goodness*; and therefore neither *pretended Tradition* nor *fresh Interpretation* of the inspired Text, can make so gross a falshood true, by the *tenth* and *eleventh* Common Notions.

Ninthly, If *Transubstantiation* be true, one and the same Body may be many thousand times bigger or less than it self at the same time, forasmuch as the *least Atom* or particle of his Body or *Transubstantiated* Bread is his whole Body as well as the *bigger lump* according to this Doctrine, which contradicts the *Twelfth* Common Notion.

Tenthly, If this Doctrine be true, The *same Individual* Body still existing and having existed many Years, may notwithstanding be made whiles it already exists, which contradicts the *Thirteenth* Common Notion.

Eleventhly, If *Transubstantiation* be true, one and the same Body may be present with it self, and many Thousands of Miles absent from it self at once;

once; be shut up in a Box, and free to walk in the Field, and to ascend into Heaven at the same time, contrary to the *Fourteenth* and *Fifteenth* Common Notions.

And lastly, If this Doctrine be true, a man may swallow his own Body *whole*, Head, Feet, Back, Belly, Arms, and Thighs, and Stomach it self through his Mouth, down his Throat into his Stomach, that is to say, every whit of himself into one knows not what of himself, less than a Mathematical Point or nothing. This Christ might have done, and actually did if he did eat the Consecrated Bread with his Disciples, which contradicts the *Sixteenth* Common Notion.

Wherefore since in vertue of *one* single *Maxim*, Monsieur Maimbourg supposing the *Protestants* as well as the *Papists* agreeing therein (though in that, as I have shew'd; he is mistaken) would draw in the *Protestants* to imbrace the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, and other Errors of the *Roman Church*, I appeal to him how much more reasonable it is, that he and as many as are of his perswasion should *relinquish* that Doctrine, it contradicting so many *Common Notions*, which not only all *Papists* and *Protestants*, but indeed all the whole World are agreed in. And hence clearly discerning the *Infalibility* of the *Roman Church*, upon which this and other erroneous Doctrines are built (such as *Invocation of Saints*, *Worshipping of Images*, and the like) plainly to fail, that they should bethink themselves what need there is to reform their Church from such gross errors, and to pray to God to put it into the mind of their Governours so to do; which would be a *peaceable method indeed for the reuniting Protestants and Catholicks in matters of Faith; and principally*

pally in the subject of the *Holy Eucharist*, as the Title of his *Method* has it.

But to require an *Union*, things standing as they are, is to expect of us that we *cease to be men* to become *Christians* of a *novel Mode* unknown to the *Primitive Church*, and under pretence of *Faith* to abjure the *indeleble Principles* of *sound Reason*, those immutable *Common Notions* which the *Eternal Logos* has *essentially* ingrafted in our *Souls*, and without which neither *Certainty* of *Faith* can consist, nor any assured sense of either the *Holy Scriptures* or any *Writing* else be found out or understood.

Soli Deo Gloria.

A N

Advertisement

TO THE

R E A D E R.

Reader,

Although I had writ some few *Notes*, such as I conceived were fit, either further to confirm, or else to clear the sense of several Passages in my *Discourse of the Real Presence*; yet in humble submission to their Judgments, that I easily prefer before my own in such Cases as these, I have willingly omitted the publishing of them *all*, saving *this*, which is upon that Passage in the first Impression of my *Discourse*, pag. 38. l. 5. but in this second Edition, pag. 35. l. 15. The Passage is this: *And yet in the same place St. Augustine says, &c. The Note this.*

In the same place, namely in the same place of Philippus Mornaus de Eucharistia, lib. 4. cap. 8. pag. 751. Docuerat (says Mornaus) post Paulum Augustinus, indui nos Christum in Baptismo; in eodem etiam Corporis & sanguinis Christi participes fieri. Now there are several places in St. Augustine, wherein he asserts that Infants partake of the Eucharist, that they may have life in them, alluding to those words of our Saviour in the sixth of St. John, v. 53, 54. Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood,

N

has

An Advertisement to the Reader.

has eternal life. *Mornaus* therefore though upon a mistake of his in History (for he goes upon this false Hypothesis, that, though the Custome of *Communicating Infants* had obtained some time in the Church, suppose from *St. Cyprian's* time somewhat onwards, yet it had been worn out again, at least for the most part, in the times of *St. Augustine* :) yet I say, his Hypothesis being given him, he rationally enough collects, and firmly concludes, that *St. Augustine*, when he argues from the communicating Infants, understood that they received the Flesh and Blood of Christ (*viz.* mentioned *John 6.*) in their very being Baptized. For the *Communicating Infants* being worn out, as *Mornaus* supposes in *St. Austin's* Time, and yet he affirming they partake of the *Eucharist*, where can they partake of it but in their Baptism? This reasoning, I say, had been firm, if *Mornaus* had not been mistaken in his Hypothesis. For it was an universal Custome even in *St. Austin's* time himself, to give the *Eucharist* to Infants after Baptism. And *Dallens* has learnedly made it out, that it was the general Custome of the whole Christian Church thus to do from *Cyprian's* time, till several Ages after *St. Austin*, the Custome being grounded upon those sayings of our Saviour in the sixth of *St. John* above-recited, *v.* 53, 54. See *Dallens de Cultibus Religiosis Latinorum*, lib. 5. cap. 3 & 4.

But so far as I see, though for sureness they added the *Eucharist* to the Baptism of Infants, yet the wiser sort of them held, that Life and Salvation by Baptism alone is obtainable, provided the other be not omitted out of contempt or wilful neglect. The words of *Fulgentius*, which *Dallens* cites, *cap. 4. pag. 587.* are remarkable as to this point. They are concerning the state of a certain *Ethiopian* Servant, who
having

An Advertisement to the Reader.

having been *Baptized*, but weak, expired before they could give him the *Eucharist*. Wherefore *Ferrandus Diaconus* proposing his doubt to *Fulgentius*, touching the state of this *Aethiopian* Servant, whether he might be saved or no; freely and judiciously answers him, that he need not to be solicitous touching that matter: for as much as every one by the very *Baptism* he receives, is made a member of Christ, and so is to be conceived to eat the *Flesh of Christ* according to the truth of the *Mystery* (*secundum Mysterii veritatem*) though he does not receive it *secundum veritatis Mysteria*. *Qui enim*, says he, *membrum corporis Christi fit, quomodo non accipit quod ipse fit? Quando utique illius fit verum corporis Membrum, cujus corporis est in sacrificio sacramentum. Hoc ergo fit ille regeneratione sancti Baptismatis, quod est de sacrificio sumpturus Altaris.* This sentence of *Fulgentius*, for the weight and elegancy of it, is worthy to be writ in Letters of Gold. I will adventure to render it in *English*, though it must needs lose of the elegancy it has in the *Latin*. For he who is made a Member of Christ, how can he but receive what he himself is made? For as much as he is made a true Member of that Body of which the consecrate Sacrament is a sign. Therefore he is made by Regeneration in holy Baptism, that which he is to receive from the Sacrament on the Altar, that is, he partakes of that *Flesh and Blood of Christ*, of which he himself pronounces, My *Flesh* is *Meat* indeed, and my *Blood* is *Drink* indeed; and he that eateth not my *Flesh* and drinketh not my *Blood*, has no life in him. Which words was the occasion of *Communicating Infants*. But this free and learned Father of the Church *Fulgentius* shows, how that they that are *Baptized* are possessed of this *Flesh and Blood* already, in virtue of their very *Baptism*. Which is the point Mor-

An Advertisement to the Reader.

naus would have won out of several Passages in *St. Austin*; but his Hypothesis failing, that attempt has proved frustraneous. But I hope this of *Fulgentius* will compensate that loss.

And further to confirm the truth of this golden Sentence of that venerable Father, I shall offer this brief Demonstration, premising these two things, *viz.* (1.) That which we partake of in our *Baptismal Regeneration* in being born of the Spirit, *John 3. v. 5, 6.* is such, as with it we are in the state of Life and Salvation, but without it we are not in the state of Life and Salvation. (2.) That which we partake of in the Celebration of the *Holy Eucharist*, in eating the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drinking his Blood, *John 6. v. 53, 54.* is such, as with it we are in the state of Life and Salvation, but without it we are not in the state of Life and Salvation. Or, which is all one, That which is such, as with it we are in the state of Life and Salvation, but without it we are not in the state of Life and Salvation, we partake of in the Celebration of the *Holy Eucharist*, in eating the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drinking his Blood.

But now to proceed. That which is such that with it we are in the state of Life and Salvation, but without it we are not in the state of Life and Salvation, where-ever that is received, it is one and the same thing *realiter*, nor can be conceived two distinct things *really separate* from one another, or not to be in the same Subject. For it plainly implies a contradiction, that they should be two several things, of each whereof *separatim* from one another, it may be said truly, That with it we are in the state of Life and Salvation, but without it we are not in the state of Life and Salvation.

As

An Advertisement to the Reader.

As let these two several things, for Argumentation sake, be *A.* and *B.* and let *C.* be the state of Life and Salvation. If we say, with *A.* we are in *C.* but without *A.* we are not in *C.* we cannot say then, with *B.* we are in *C.* but without *B.* we are not in *C.* For [With *A.* we are in *C.*] is a plain contradiction to [Without *B.* we are not in *C.*] and [Without *A.* we are not in *C.*] is a plain contradiction to [With *B.* we are in *C.*] Whence it is a manifest Repugnancy to conceive otherwise, than that *A.* and *B.* that have been, for Dispute sake, supposed to be *really* different things, must be one and the same thing *realiter*, as the Schools speak, and as we have above explained.

It remains only now that we make good the two *Points* we have premised.

First then, Whenas our Saviour says to *Nicodemus*, *John 3. 3.* *Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God*; Certainly, *seeing the Kingdom of God*, does imply at least so much, that he that is thus born again is in the state of Life and Salvation: Our Church Catechism also seeming to express this Priviledge touching Baptism, by an *Inheritour of the Kingdom of Heaven*, as if by our Baptismal Regeneration, we become Heirs that have a Right to that Celestial Kingdom. And *St. Paul* says expressly to *Titus*, *Ch. 3.* We are saved *Lavacro Regenerationis*. And then when he says, *Except a man be born of Water and the Spirit he cannot see the Kingdom of God*, does it not plainly imply, that if he be born of Water and the Spirit, that he shall see the Kingdom of God, and so be in the state of Life and Salvation. Which yet he *is not* according to the very Words of our Saviour, unless he be born of Water and the Spirit. And therefore in our Baptismal Regeneration

An Advertisement to the Reader.

neration in being born of the Spirit, *v. 6.* we partake of that with which we are in the state of Life and Salvation, and without which we are not in the state of Life and Salvation, according to the *first Point* premised.

The second, *viz.* That which we partake of in the *Holy Eucharist*, in eating the Flesh of Christ and drinking his Blood, is such, as with it we are in the state of Life and Salvation, and without it we are not in the state of Life and Salvation, *this is expressly* declared *John 6. 53, 54. Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, &c.* Wherefore in being born of the spirit in our *Baptismal Regeneration*, we then partake of the *Flesh* and *Blood* of Christ, as we do afterwards in the *Holy Communion*, it being repugnant that they should be *two really distinct* things, as was demonstrated above. But in being born of the spirit, we do not partake of the *natural* Flesh and Blood of Christ, and therefore there is as *St. Jerome* phrases it (for not *Gratian*, but *St. Jerome*, is the first Author of that distinction) a *Divine* or *Spiritual* Flesh and Blood (distinct from his *Natural*) which we partake of both in *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*. In the one as the *Seed and Element* of our *Regeneration*, in the other as the *Aliment* or *Nutrimment* of our *New Birth*.

This is clear enough already, but that the Reader may not suspect any trick put upon him in my using a Geometrical Form in a Theological Argument, I will exhibit the proof of *Fulgentius* his assertion in yet a more close and succinct way, reducing all into one single Syllogism, Thus :

That with which we are in the state of Life and Salvation, and without it we are not in the state of Life

An Advertisement to the Reader.

Life and Salvation, is the thing received in the *Holy Eucharist*, in eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of Christ.

But the thing received in *Baptism* in being born of the Spirit, is that with which we are in the state of Life and Salvation, and without it we are not in the state of Life and Salvation.

Therefore the thing received in *Baptism*, in being born of the spirit, is the thing received in the *Holy Eucharist* in eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of Christ; which is the very assertion of that excellent Father of the Church *Fulgentius*, which I undertook to demonstrate to be true, which I have done accordingly in this single Syllogism, the two premised Points having been clearly proved before.

Thus have I finished my *Note* upon this single Passage of my *Discourse* of the *Real Presence*, in which *Mornæus* is found not rightly to have understood St. *Austin*; and being not conscious to my self of any mistake in the management of the said *Discourse*, but *this*, I thought it necessary, though I omit all the rest, to publish this *Note* upon that Passage out of *Mornæus*, wherein St. *Austin* is concerned, That if any Antagonist appear, he may be prevented from triumphing in the Discovery of a Mistake, which is acknowledged to be such already; and that others in the mean time may be more punctually informed, nor be led into any Error touching this present Matter by this Passage in my Book.

I will only add this reasonable Request of the Reader, and so conclude, *viz.* That, since it has been thought fit to speak of St. *Jerome's* Divine or Spiritual Body of Christ (who is the *Logos Incarnate*) only in *general*, he will not be so ill-natured as to conceive any condition of it in *particular*, or fix any sense,

An Advertisement to the Reader.

sense, which he thinks *most absurd*. But if he have several incongruous conceits thereof, that he would be so *humane* as to think the most tolerable to be my sense: But if he will so far strain courtesy with himself, as not to rest in his thoughts till he has found out such a sense as he thinks *congruous* and *unexceptionable*, and will be so *Heroically Candid and Charitable* as to take that to be my meaning, I can assure him he has not much missed the Mark. For the distinct *Idea* which I have thereof, after anxious and impartial scrutiny, is such as clashes with neither Scripture nor sound Reason, nor with any truly Apostolick Doctrine so far as I can judge. And so far as it shall be found clashing with any of these, so far shall I willingly disown it and discard it from being mine.

T H E E N D.

*Books Written by the same Author, and Printed for
Walter Kettilby, at the Bishops Head in S^t Pauls
Church-Yard.*

H*enrici Mori Opera Theologica & Philosophica,
three Vol. in Fol.*

———'s Exposition on *Daniel*, *Quarto*.

———'s Exposition on the *Apocalypse*, *Quarto*.

———'s Answer to several Remarks on his Expositions on *Daniel*, and the *Apocalypse*.

———'s Illustration of *Daniel*, and the *Revelation*, by continued, brief but clear Notes, from Chapter to Chapter, and from Verse to Verse, with very useful and apposite Arguments prefixed to each Chapter, framed out of his Expositions.

———'s *Paralipomena Prophetica*, containing several Supplements and Defences of his Expositions of the Prophet *Daniel* and the *Apocalypse*, whereby the impregnable Firmness and Solidity of the said Expositions is further evidenced to the World. Whereunto is also added *Philisicrines* upon R. B. his Notes on the *Revelation* of S^t John.

———'s Confutation of Judiciary Astrology against *Butler*, *Quarto*.

———'s Reply to the Answer to his Antidote against Idolatry, with his Appendix, *Octavo*.

———'s Remarks on Judge *Hales* of Fluid Bodies, 8^o

There are likewise lately Printed for *Walter Kettilby* these Books following.

Doctor *Scott*'s Christian Life in three *Vol*.

———'s Sermon before the Lord Mayor, *Sept. 2. 86*.

Mr. *Kidder*'s Sermon at Mr. *William Allen*'s Funeral, *August 17. 1686*.

An Answer to a late Printed Paper given about by some of the Church of *Rome*, in a Letter to a Gentleman. The second Edition.